Christian Clergy in American Politics

EDITED BY

Sue E. S. Crawford and Laura R. Olson

VISIT…

CHRISTIAN CLERGY IN AMERICAN POLITICS

This page intentionally left blank

Christian Clergy in American Politics

EDITED BY
Sue E. S. Crawford and
Laura R. Olson

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS
BALTIMORE AND LONDON

© 2001 The Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved. Published 2001
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltmore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data will be found at the end of this book.

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0-8018-6704-5

CONTENTS

List of Tables *vii*
Preface *ix*

I | INTRODUCTION

1 Clergy in Politics: Political Choices and Consequences 3
LAURA R. OLSON AND SUE E. S. CRAWFORD

2 Notes for a Theory of Clergy as Political Leaders 15
TED G. JELEN

3 Reflections on the Status of Research on Clergy in Politics 30
JAMES L. GUTH

II | POLITICAL CHOICES

4 Gender and the Political Choices of Women Clergy 47
SUE E. S. CRAWFORD, MELISSA M. DECKMAN, AND CHRISTI J. BRAUN

5 Theocratic, Prophetic, and Ecumenical: Political Roles of African American Clergy 66
MARY R. SAWYER

6 The Construction of Political Strategies among African American Clergy 85
KATIE DAY

7 Clergy as Political Actors in Urban Contexts 104
SUE E. S. CRAWFORD AND LAURA R. OLSON

8 American Church or Church in America? The Politics of Catholic Bishops in Comparative Perspective 120
TIMOTHY A. BYRNES

9 The Mobilization of a Religious Elite: Political Activism among Southern Baptist Clergy in 1996 139
JAMES L. GUTH

10 Reformed Preachers in Politics 157
JAMES M. PENNING AND CORWIN E. SMIDT

III | POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

11 Shaping Pacifism: The Role of the Local Anabaptist Pastor 177
JOEL S. FETZER

12 Cardinal O'Connor and His Constituents: Differential Benefits and Public Evaluations 188
PAUL A. DJUPE

13 To March or Not to March: Clergy Mobilization Strategies and Grassroots Antidrug Activism 203
JAMES C. CAVENDISH

IV | CONCLUSION

14 Choices and Consequences in Context 227
SUE E. S. CRAWFORD AND LAURA R. OLSON

Notes 239
References 253
Contributors 275
Index 281

TABLES

4.1	Summary of Women Clergy's Comments on Issue Choices	54
4.2	Summary of Women Clergy's Comments on Constraints	60
4.3	Summary of Women Clergy's Comments on Assets	63
7.1	Total Number of Clergy Activities, by Low-Income Neighborhood Index	111
7.2	Test of the Government Attention Hypothesis	117
9.1	Southern Baptist Clergy's Organizational Mobilization and Political Participation	150
9.2	Determinants of Overall Pastoral Activism	154
10.1	Political Pronouncements and Candidate Activities of Clergy in the Christian Reformed Church and Reformed Church in America, by Degree of Orthodoxy	162
10.2	Campaign Activities of Reformed Clergy, by Degree of Orthodoxy	164
10.3	Joining and Church Activities of Reformed Clergy, by Degree of Orthodoxy	166
10.4	Contacting and Protest Activities of Reformed Clergy, by Degree of Orthodoxy	167
10.5	Determinants of Reformed Clergy's Activism	169
11.1	Effects of Anabaptist Pastors' Pacifism and Background on Parishioners' Pacifism	182
12.1	Effects of Parishioner Benefit Evaluations and Political Agreement on Approval of John Cardinal O'Connor's Job Performance	200
13.1	Parishioners' Feelings of Political Efficacy, by Attendance at Religious Services	213
13.2	Parishioners' Attitudes about the Importance of Participation in Parish Ministry, by Attendance at Religious Services	215
13.3	Parishioners' Positions on the Benefits of Antidrug Marches, by Attendance at Religious Services	219
13.4	Factors Affecting Parishioners' Participation in Antidrug Marches	220

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

Active citizenship in a democratic polity is rooted in political participation and in shared understandings of that citizenship. Throughout American history, organized religion has played key roles in shaping the meaning of democratic citizenship in the United States. It has mobilized citizens to work for the abolition of slavery, to protest for civil rights, to oppose the secularization of schools, and, most recently, to push for international debt relief for developing countries. As the organizational elites of American religion, clergy have the potential to play a key role in the crafting of citizens in a democratic polity. Research on the roles of clergy in politics has been rather scarce, however.

This volume brings together scholars from various disciplines to examine how, why, and when clergy involve themselves in politics—and what consequences their political action (or inaction) creates for their professional careers, for their congregations, and for American democracy. We focus specifically on Christian clergy out of necessity, not choice; there is currently a severe shortage of research being done on clergy from the many non-Christian religious traditions that are flowering in the United States. It is our hope that this volume will infuse a new energy into the study of clergy as political actors, and that the research presented here will spur debate among clergy, laity, and political leaders concerning the roles of clergy in our political system.

Clergy can become involved in politics as public citizens, but they also have unique opportunities to shape the ways that others approach politics. The chapters in this volume address the political roles that clergy play in both of these capacities. The introductory chapters lay a theoretical foundation for the study of the choices that clergy make about politics and the impact that they can have in a democratic polity. Several pieces focus on how religious tradition, gender, race, and neighborhood characteristics shape clergy's choices about political participation. Other chapters examine the political consequences of those choices, including the extent to which clergy can shape the political attitudes and behavior of others. The final chapter summarizes the other chapters' contributions to our understanding of clergy in politics—and raises questions for new research.

This volume represents the first effort to interweave recent threads of re-

search on clergy involvement in politics. It contributes to the scholarship of religion, politics, and public policy by uncovering the vast array of factors that influence the political choices clergy make—and the consequences of those choices. We also advance the literature on clergy in politics by examining a broad range of religious backgrounds and political activities, by using a diverse set of methodological approaches, and by emphasizing the importance of the various contextual factors that shape clergy's political choices and their consequences. While the volume's findings are diverse, each chapter demonstrates that the *contexts* within which clergy live and work shape the interplay of religion and politics.

Our shared impression that a small but diverse group of scholars were studying the involvement of clergy in politics was the impetus for this volume. In 1998 we began recruiting scholars to write chapters. We then organized a miniconference that brought many of these scholars together for a fruitful working weekend at Creighton University. We owe much to everyone who participated in that conference. Those who presented papers provided the substance for our conversations. David Bodenhamer and John Green, who served as commentators on each of the chapters, provided valuable comments to the authors and the editors. They invested considerable time and effort in reviewing the chapters and in shaping discussions of the common themes in the chapters. Others who attended the conference also provided useful comments and suggestions. The coherence and quality of the volume owes much to the hard work of all of the people who joined us for the weekend in Omaha.

Many other people and organizations also helped to make this volume a reality. Most of all we thank each of the contributors for sharing their work with us and for meeting all of our deadlines and requests with punctuality and good humor. It was a joy to work with each of them. The Creighton conference was made possible by the generous support of the Nebraska Humanities Council, the Center for the Study of Religion and Society at Creighton University, and the College of Business and Public Affairs at Clemson University. Tom Mans deserves credit for putting the idea of a conference and edited volume on the table. Bryan LeBeau provided valuable assistance in the planning and granting processes. The conference and granting process went smoothly because of Kay Replogle's assistance with paperwork and logistics. Later in the editing process, a postdoctoral fellowship at Princeton University's Center for

the Study of Religion enabled Laura Olson to complete extensive work on the manuscript.

We cannot say enough good things about the support and mentoring that we have received from senior scholars of religion and politics throughout this process. We are grateful for their time, attention, and commitment. In particular, we would like to acknowledge the generous support we have received from John Green, James Guth, Ted Jelen, Corwin Smidt, Kenneth Wald, and Robert Wuthnow. Henry Tom at the Johns Hopkins University Press believed in the value of this project from the beginning and helped immeasurably in seeing it through to publication. We would also like to thank Janet Biehl, Bette Evans, Lyman Kellstedt, and Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz for their helpful contributions to the conference and book. We are also grateful for the love and support of our families and many good friends. Special thanks are due to David Crawford, who is not only a wonderful spouse to Sue but rose above and beyond the call of duty in providing advice, support, transportation, and humor. Finally, this project would not have been possible were it not for the willingness of thousands of clergy to respond to the requests of researchers. We thank all of these clergy for their willingness to share in the research process. It is our hope that this volume represents them well.

This page intentionally left blank

1 Clergy in Politics: Political Choices and Consequences

LAURA R. OLSON AND
SUE E. S. CRAWFORD

Despite the official separation of church and state in the United States, clergy have played integral roles in American politics since the colonial period. John Witherspoon of New Jersey was a signer of the Declaration of Independence—and a minister. Abraham Baldwin of Georgia was one of the framers of the U.S. Constitution—and a minister. Countless other clergy have shaped the course of American politics, perhaps none so famously as Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.[1] Clergy have led and opposed social movements and made countless statements on political topics and political candidates. Clergy have also played a variety of roles in social service delivery, ranging from nineteenth-century mutual aid societies to today's vast array of nonprofit organizations and public-private partnerships.

Whether and how clergy become involved in politics is a subject of great importance because clergy have the capacity to shape the definition of democratic citizenship for Americans. Because the United States is so religiously pluralistic, clergy who represent every imaginable religious tradition have opportunities to be involved in politics. Because American political culture has heavy religious overtones, emphasis is often placed on morality in American politics—both in debates about political issues and in discussions of the duties of democratic citizens. This emphasis places clergy, who are by definition in the business of defining and promoting morality, in a unique position to shape democratic norms and to influence policy debates—when they have sufficient interest, motivation, and flexibility. American religious pluralism adds to this mix by ensuring that myriad religious voices will be competing to define both morality and citizenship.

What compels *today's* clergy to become involved in politics? Consider some of the views they have shared with us in recent personal interviews. "I think that politics cannot be separated from daily life and . . . life at the church," said a New Orleans pastor. "They are intricately woven together. . . . so I think that

clergy should be engaged at the deepest level, because politics impacts all of our lives" (personal interview, 17 January 2000). This notion that clergy ought to be involved in political activity is by no means universally shared, but ministers who are interested in participating in politics can find a number of justifications for their position. "Ministry is [for the] whole person, [and] that extends into politics," said an Omaha pastor. "Presbyterian theologians used to like to . . . say that 'You should write your sermons with the Bible in one hand and the newspaper in the other.' So I guess [that is] the way I approach preaching. . . . I'm very careful to follow the lectionary, and I start with the biblical text, and then relate it to what's happening in this congregation, nationally, or internationally" (personal interview, 24 March 1998).

Clergy who participate heavily in politics are often motivated by their own intrinsic interest in politics, which often stems from their personal background. "I was brought up in a church where the clergy were very involved," said another Omaha pastor. "My mother was one of the lay leaders, and she was on the city council, and she was elected . . . from a kind of a grassroots effort that the churches spearheaded through their Industrial Areas Foundations. . . . Our church was very much a part of that, and I look to those clergy leaders. If they had not been involved, I do not think that the church would have been as involved. And so I was brought up considering it to be normative for clergy to kind of set a path for politics" (personal interview, 10 June 1998).

Clergy do not become involved in politics without taking some risks. Political involvement can, in fact, be very risky for them. Alexis de Tocqueville explained that nineteenth-century American clergy had great political power but were careful to avoid explicit affiliations with political parties, as such entanglement might have eroded this power (1840/1969). Other risks, such as loss of livelihood or legitimacy, also factor into clergy's political choices. Although today's emphasis on morality politics creates an opening for clergy to meld their religious profession with political action, few clergy face easy choices in deciding whether and how to become involved in politics. Their first priority must be the maintenance of their congregations, which by necessity leaves political activity as a secondary pursuit.

Most clergy do not undertake political activity without being well aware of the risks it entails. "To my way of thinking," said a pastor in western Colorado, "the gospel is the most important aspect of our work. So I don't want

to create a stumbling block for people who might possibly come and discover that gospel if at the same time I make statements in a political realm that will drive them away from us" (personal interview, 18 January 2000). And when clergy speak on controversial issues, people very often do leave their churches. This is not an insignificant concern in the competitive religious marketplace that exists in the United States. "I have been stung doing political stuff," said an Omaha pastor. "I spoke on homosexuality and got slammed by two members who didn't agree with my positions. . . . Another time I wrote an opinion letter to the paper speaking out about Rush Limbaugh and his views, and someone in the congregation said, 'He can't do that, doesn't he know who pays his salary?'" (personal interview, 4 August 1999).

Those clergy who do wish to take their chances by engaging in political activity frequently face additional obstacles. "I have found it difficult in both of my pastoral placements to find a lot of help and . . . understanding . . . from the congregation," said a pastor in southern Missouri. "Much of the social and political activity that I perform, I do independently of them. I would consider that to be one of my great frustrations in ministry. Occasionally I will find an individual who will aid me in the effort. But that hasn't happened very often" (personal interview, 26 January 2000). Some ministers question whether clergy can make a difference in contemporary American politics. "I'm a little jaded," said a pastor in Des Moines. ". . . I'm not sure [we make a difference] anymore. The local paper at the end of last year . . . did 'most influential [local] people of the twentieth century.' They compared them with the most influential of the [1800s, when] . . . the majority of them . . . were clergy. . . . [Clergy] were the movers and the shakers of [the nineteenth] century. . . . [But] in the twentieth century, money is power" (personal interview, 12 January 2000). Finally, some clergy are simply not interested in politics—or choose not to take the risk of extending their leadership into the world of politics for other reasons. "I believe I should be a responsible citizen," said a pastor in Milwaukee, "but I don't believe God put me here to be an activist. I don't think that's why I'm here. . . . I believe the most important thing that we have to do is to lead people to know and to make a personal commitment to Jesus Christ. That's why I'm here" (personal interview, 12 July 1994).

Morality and American Politics

Morality politics is alive and well as the twenty-first century dawns in the United States. From controversial struggles over abortion and gay rights to questions about excessive sex and violence in the entertainment media, the politics of morality continues to generate splashy headlines. Even economic debates, such as the federal government's decisions about conducting normal trade relations with other countries and its sweeping reform of the welfare system, increasingly have come to be cast in moral and religious terms. More attention is also being paid to ending religious persecution abroad and enhancing organized religion's role in assisting the poor through the Charitable Choice provision of the 1996 Federal Welfare Reform Act. Hunter (1991, 1994) goes further by arguing that the *dominant* division in politics is now a moral cleavage that has exploded into "culture wars." He argues that the prominent political and social divisions in the United States are now based on assumptions about the source of moral authority, which has created a schism between people with socially conservative beliefs and those with progressive beliefs. Although there is reason to question whether the "culture wars" division has really replaced older divisions in public opinion and politics (DiMaggio, Evans, and Bryson 1996; Williams 1997), it is indisputable that the recent public debate over moral and cultural matters has been keen.

Consider as an illustration the debate about gay marriage, which is one of the flashpoints of conflict in today's morality politics. Clergy are on the front lines of *both sides* of the conflict over this morally charged issue. Compare, for example, Rev. Jimmy Creech, formerly of Omaha, Nebraska, and Rev. David Yearick of Greenville, South Carolina, both of whom have fought in the battle over gay marriage. The United Methodist Church defrocked Creech on November 17, 1999, for officiating at a union ceremony between two men (McCord 1999). Yearick, on the other hand, was one of the chief organizers of a large rally for "traditional family values" and led his congregation in a roadside demonstration of support when the Greenville County Council passed a resolution denouncing "gay lifestyles" (King 1997). Creech argued before the jury of Methodist clergy who voted to remove him from the ministry that the church's position on homosexuality is "incompatible with Christian teaching" and akin to racism because it implies that homosexuals are inferior to het-

erosexuals. Meanwhile Yearick teaches his South Carolina congregation that "homosexuality [is] an abomination" and that "recent floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, and earthquakes are evidence of God's impending judgment on America" (King 1997).

Clearly Creech and Yearick, and thousands of their contemporaries, are at loggerheads about gay marriage. Their beliefs are structured by their theological viewpoints, their religious traditions, their personal political opinions, and the characteristics and geographical location of their congregations. A curious—and telling—similarity exists between the Creech and Yearick, however: both would almost certainly say that their activities are *demanded* by their desire to remain true to their faith.

Even in a supposedly secularizing world, the United States has remained a highly religious country, which makes clergy's political choices all the more significant. Despite some scholars' predictions about the demise of organized religion, 94 percent of Americans say they believe in God, and over half claim to attend religious services at least once a month (Fowler, Hertzke, and Olson 1999, 28–37). Even if this attendance figure is inflated, as some have argued (see Hadaway, Marler, and Chaves 1993), religious belief and observance in the United States still outstrips that of other advanced capitalist democracies.

Clergy in American Politics

As religious professionals and leaders in the powerful social institution that is organized religion, clergy find themselves in a unique position to shape the interplay of religion and politics in the United States. The very organization within which they work carries the force of moral suasion. At least once a week, clergy have ample opportunity (if they choose to take advantage of it) to provide political cues for others in sermons, study groups, and lessons. For the most part, clergy do appear to use these opportunities to discuss politics at least on occasion (Guth et al. 1997; Olson 2000; Penning and Smidt chapter 10). The cues they give do not fall on deaf ears (Fetzer chapter 11; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988, 1990), and there is some evidence that clergy can have an effect on the political behavior of their congregations (Cavendish chapter 13).

Clergy can also choose to participate directly in politics and the policy process (Crawford 1995; Guth et al. 1997; Jelen 1993; Olson 2000). Even some noted political officials and candidates have been ordained clergy, such as Rev.

Jesse Jackson, Rev. Pat Robertson, and several members of the U.S. Congress. The civil rights movement would almost certainly have been less successful were it not for the political involvement of clergy (Findlay 1993; Friedland 1998; Morris 1984; Sawyer chapter 5). Some bring religious thought and experiences to bear on policy discussions (Crawford 1995; Crawford and Olson chapter 7; Demerath and Williams 1992; Fuechtmann 1989). Some are active in citywide coalitions to address poverty, racism, and violence (Crawford 1995; Crawford and Olson chapter 7; Olson 2000). Some develop partnerships with social service agencies and police departments through their congregations or through other religious nonprofit organizations (Crawford 1995; Leland 1998). Some foster nongovermental efforts to provide social services or community development (Crawford 1995; Harris 1995; Hodgkinson, Weitzman, and Kirsch 1993; Miller 1993; Wineburg 1992). The recent Charitable Choice provision of the Welfare Reform Act will undoubtedly increase the number of clergy engaged in partnerships with government agencies to provide social services.

This short summary of clergy activities reveals the many different ways in which they become engaged in politics. Some of these activities, such as protesting or speaking on behalf of candidates or issues, involve clergy in contested debates over who should run the government and what it should do. Other activities, such as participating in government-sponsored coalitions or partnering with government to provide social services, allow clergy to have a more subtle political impact. The chapters in this volume address clergy's choices about this broad spectrum of political activities as well as the consequences of those choices.

Clergy confront a wide variety of constraints as they form themselves into public citizens and decide what roles they will play in shaping the political views and actions of others. Even though clergy can embrace political attitudes as divergent as those of Jimmy Creech and David Yearick, all must confront the question of *whether* they wish to translate their religious authority into the political realm. The choices they make affect the members of their congregations in ways that are both obvious and subtle. This volume explains some of the interesting differences and similarities that characterize the choices Christian[2] clergy make about political involvement and the consequences of their choices. We pay special attention to the impact that the contexts in which clergy live and work have on those choices and their conse-

quences. This volume's chapters illustrate how the choices that clergy make about politics have important ramifications for democratic citizenship.

The introductory chapters by Ted Jelen and James Guth lay theoretical foundations for the study of clergy's choices and their consequences in a democratic polity. Jelen summarizes much of what we already know about clergy in politics. He uses existing studies to create a theoretical framework that identifies the types of resources that shape clergy's political capacities and strategies. He also sets forth a typology that classifies different kinds of political consequences of clergy action. While Jelen focuses largely on what we already know, Guth considers what we have yet to learn. Subsequent chapters draw upon the foundations established by Jelen and Guth to explore how gender, race, poverty, political conditions, and religious traditions affect clergy as they decide whether and how to act as public citizens or political educators. Several additional chapters deal with the consequences of clergy's choices, including whether clergy can shape the political attitudes and behavior of others, thereby shaping the form of citizenship. Each chapter shows that while clergy make a wide variety of choices about becoming involved in politics, all are bound together by the fact that their choices have implications for the formation of democratic citizenship and civil society in the United States.

Political Choices

Clergy consider a wide variety of factors when they choose whether to include political action among their responsibilities. The types of issues they choose to address, as well as the types of actions they choose to take, are shaped by their religious traditions' theological teachings and traditions. A recent study by Guth and his colleagues (1997) drives this point home by showing that different religious traditions embrace different "social theologies" that shape their encounters with politics. Several chapters in this volume address the notion of social theology in African American, Catholic, and white Protestant traditions. Other contextual variables, however, also play a role in the choices clergy make about political activism.

One important personal context that influences clergy's decisions about when, whether, and how to participate in politics is gender. In recent years a growing number of women have been entering the ministry and rabbinate in

the United States (Chang 1997; Zikmund et al. 1998). Much speculation is afoot about the future impact of women clergy, especially in the Protestant mainline. In chapter 4 Sue Crawford, Melissa Deckman, and Christi Braun show how gender shapes the political issues women clergy address. They also use women's own words to demonstrate how gender can either constrain or serve as an asset for political activity.

The most politically significant personal context for clergy in the United States undoubtedly is race. Clergy's approaches to politics have differed greatly along racial lines. Many African American clergy have long been more comfortable translating their authority into the political realm than have their colleagues from other racial and ethnic groups; many black clergy are involved in bringing economic development to their communities (Miller 1993). Two chapters in this volume explore the complex dance between religion and politics among African American clergy. Mary Sawyer devotes chapter 5 to the historical connections between religion, political contexts, and the crafting of democratic citizenship in the African American community. In chapter 6 Katie Day presents an in-depth account of the community development strategies chosen by African American clergy in one urban area (Philadelphia). Day shows that their choices—and their understanding of the theological justifications for these choices—vary based on the contexts within which they live and have been socialized.

The socioeconomic status of the area surrounding the church where a minister works may also influence his or her political choices. In an economically depressed section of a major city, clergy may feel compelled to mobilize themselves and others to address poverty and its accompanying social problems. In Milwaukee, for example, a clergy-run coalition called Milwaukee Innercity Congregations Allied for Hope is heavily involved in the policy process surrounding issues of poverty and crime at the local level (Olson 2000). In chapter 7 Sue Crawford and Laura Olson evaluate the political significance of location and examine ways in which the congregational neighborhood's socioeconomic status influences pastors' decisions about getting involved in local policymaking.

National political context also plays an important role in shaping the choices clergy make about political involvement. In chapter 8 Timothy Byrnes discusses how Catholic bishops in the United States and Poland are constrained in different ways by the same hierarchical Church structure. Bishops

in both countries find ways to rise to the challenge of promoting participation and citizenship in their different national contexts. The political significance of Catholic clergy should not be underestimated. In the United States the Catholic hierarchy is becoming increasingly bold in its engagement with the political realm. In late 1999 the U.S. Catholic Conference and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops released their quadrennial statement on election-year issues, entitled *Faithful Citizenship: Civic Responsibility for a New Millennium.* More than ever before, the bishops' sweeping statement aims to provide direct guidance to Catholic voters by providing them with ten social justice questions to ask candidates (Niebuhr 1999).

The political choices of Protestant clergy are the subject of chapters 9 and 10. James Guth studies clergy in the Southern Baptist Convention, and James Penning and Corwin Smidt examine clergy in the Dutch Reformed tradition. Guth explores various explanatory models of the political engagement of Southern Baptist clergy and demonstrates how scholars can better examine the mobilization of clergy by political elites. Although the Southern Baptist Convention historically has downplayed direct contact with the political world and endorsed the principle of separation of church and state, Southern Baptist clergy are now commonly seen as a major component of the Christian Right. As one example, consider Rev. Wiley Drake, a Baptist pastor who was one of the major forces behind his denomination's well-publicized boycott of the Walt Disney Company ("Preacher Behind Disney Boycott" 1997).

For many years, scholars thought *mainline* Protestant clergy were most likely to choose to engage in political action (Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974). Mainline clergy were heavily involved in the civil rights movement (Findlay 1993; Friedland 1998), and for many years mainline denominations have maintained official lobbying offices in Washington, D.C. In chapter 2, however, Jelen reviews evidence that conservative clergy may now be equally likely to act politically, and in chapter 3 Guth discusses the fact that earlier notions of mainline prominence may have been due in part to the *types* of political activity that earlier scholars investigated. Penning and Smidt, in their study of Reformed clergy in chapter 10, provide additional evidence that challenges the notion that the mainline-evangelical divide corresponds to a clear difference in willingness to engage in politics. At the same time, they demonstrate that the mainline-evangelical divide does still translate into different theological motivations behind political action.

Political Consequences

Do the political choices of clergy really matter? Certainly some of them do. Consider the example of Rev. Eugene Rivers, a Pentecostal African American pastor who runs the Ella J. Baker House in Dorchester, Massachusetts, one of the poorest sections of Boston. He helps train police from other cities about how law enforcement and organized religion can work together to prevent crime and rehabilitate those who commit it. He is highly critical of mainline African American religious leaders, and his actual congregation is very small. Nevertheless, Rivers is making a difference in the lives of Boston's poor and attracting substantial national attention in the process (Leland 1998).

Can clergy's political statements influence the views of their congregation members? The likelihood that congregation members will listen to a pastor's political pronouncements certainly varies depending upon the congregation's religious tradition and the minister's personality. In chapter 11 Joel Fetzer explores whether Anabaptist clergy are able to speak with effectiveness on a topic central to their religious tradition: pacifism. His chapter contributes to our knowledge of the effects of Anabaptist clergy action and to the development of better methods to test the political consequences of clergy action.

Religious leaders who become involved in the political realm risk alienating their flocks. This is a particular concern for clergy who occupy positions of great visibility, such as those whose church services are broadcast on television or public leaders of religious hierarchies. In chapter 12 Paul Djupe provides a theoretical framework for examining one of the principal negative consequences clergy fear: loss of approval by their followers. He tests the extent to which the archbishop of New York, John Cardinal O'Connor, suffered consequences for making controversial political statements on issues such as abortion. In light of O'Connor's recent death, it is particularly interesting to reflect on the strong reactions he invoked among New York City Catholics.

In chapter 13 James Cavendish shows that personal charisma and ability to frame political issues as religious issues can help clergy mobilize a congregation for activism. Certainly this was the case for the African American clergy who were so central to the civil rights movement, both individually and collectively. The ability to make people *listen* to a message and *respond* to it—rather than just hearing it—is an indispensable asset for clergy who wish to

make a difference in the political realm. Personal charisma is nearly impossible to quantify, but with apologies to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart, you know it when you see it.[3] Cavendish presents a direct look at the story of one charismatic priest, Rev. Michael Pfleger, who, against strong odds, has succeeded in mobilizing his parishioners for antidrug marches in their impoverished Chicago neighborhood.

In the United States, religious freedom creates a unique political context for clergy. They can raise their voices to try to bring about changes in policy, raise awareness about issues, and stimulate others to take action. Moreover, religious freedom has allowed for a flowering of religious diversity. Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and all stripes of Christians coexist and worship with remarkably little conflict. Freedom from government intervention is the most basic ingredient of the American political *context* within which all clergy operate.

Because of the great latitude afforded by this context, American clergy can choose to extend their leadership from the spiritual realm into the political realm. Just as they shape religious outlooks, clergy may also play an important role in shaping political worldviews and notions of community responsibility among their flocks. As such, clergy are important players in the process of creating and sustaining democratic citizenship and civil society. Recent research (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995) shows that places of worship are fertile breeding grounds for the "civic skills" needed for active political participation. People who are actively involved in organized religious life often gain skills from their experiences that translate directly into the political realm. For example, organizing a meeting (or even a bake sale) for a church, synagogue, or mosque provides experience that can be used later to facilitate a petition drive or protest. Moreover, places of worship are themselves sometimes the locus of political socialization or mobilization—or both (Gilbert 1993; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988, 1990). Clergy play a vital role in shaping distinctive political contexts within their congregations.

Clergy have constituted a visible and powerful political force at various times throughout American history. At other times they have been rather silent. The issues and views they choose to advocate are as diverse as American religion is pluralistic. But whether or not they are making headlines, clergy reach millions of Americans each week. Whether or not their words are explicitly political, the messages they convey in their sermons, teachings, and in-

formal conversations shape the ways Americans think about how to order their lives together in the religious, social, and political realms. Even though all clergy in the United States work within a political context that grants them great freedom to act politically, there is great diversity in the contexts within which they live and work. Likewise there is great diversity in the religious contexts of their denominations and congregations, and great diversity in the contexts in which clergy have been socialized. The chapters in this volume demonstrate how these divergent contexts shape the political choices clergy make, and consequences of those choices for democratic politics in the United States.

2 Notes for a Theory of Clergy as Political Leaders

TED G. JELEN

The focus of this volume on the role of clergy as political leaders is both appropriate and timely. This topic integrates two emerging and somewhat disparate literatures. First, the past two decades have witnessed an increased appreciation for the effects that religious beliefs have on political behavior. In the United States, the apparent rise, fall, and rejuvenation of the Christian Right and the associated realignment of religious conservatives to the Republican Party have been among the most important political trends of the past several decades. Similarly, the political activism of the American Catholic bishops during the Reagan and Bush administrations raised important questions about the Catholic Church's appropriate role in secular affairs. Internationally, religion has been a fertile source of regional conflict in settings such as South Asia, the Middle East, and the Balkans. Samuel Huntington (1996) has proposed a general framework for the study of international relations in which "civilizations" (which are largely religiously defined) are the central units of analysis. Thus religion, and by extension religious leadership, are being recognized as central variables in the study of politics.

Second, the past decade has witnessed a renewed emphasis among scholars on the importance of democratic citizenship. There has been a revival of research on "voluntary organizations" (first noted by Tocqueville in 1840) and a growing concern about the sources and consequences of "social capital" (see especially Putnam 1995). Since religious congregations are among the most popular voluntary organizations in the United States (Wald 1997), it seems self-evident that they are also important sites of political learning. Moreover, a substantial body of research (Gilbert 1993; Jelen 1992b; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988) has shown that the congregation is often an irreducible source of political attitudes that cannot be understood as a simple surrogate for group membership or individual belief systems. As such, clergy undoubtedly have the capacity to shape the political beliefs, attitudes, and skills of their congregations. If people learn how to be good citizens in voluntary organizations, then

the teachings of the leaders of voluntary organizations (in this case clergy) should be a crucial ingredient in any recipe for democratic citizenship. Recent research (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995) has shown quite clearly that participation in religious organizations is an important source of political learning for laity, and indeed that churches are perhaps the *only* voluntary organizations that empower citizens who are otherwise politically disadvantaged. Therefore, the extent, style, and motivation of political activism among clergy have important implications for the practice of democratic politics.

The general topic of clergy as political leaders has generated a substantial amount of research with diverse methods, foci, and findings. Some of the early work in this field showed political activism to be the primary province of theologically and politically liberal clergy (Quinley 1974) and a source of significant tensions between pastors and their congregations (see especially Hadden 1969). Some of my work (Jelen 1993, 1994a) has shown that clergy across the political and theological spectrums all possess certain resources that may have political value, but their levels of activism are variously limited by theological considerations. However, Guth and colleagues (1997) have recently presented evidence that Protestant clergy appear to conform to a religious "two-party" system and that there are no important differences in their levels of activism. What these divergent findings ultimately mean is that the amount and consequences of political activity among clergy are *variables* that differ across time periods, religious traditions, and demographic characteristics. Any general theory of clergy in politics must, in the final analysis, account for these differences.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a starting point for a more focused effort to explain variation in the causes and consequences of the political activity of clergy. The scholarship of the past several decades clearly shows that clergy in the United States and elsewhere are likely to be important political actors for some time to come. The task of understanding the various political roles played by priests, ministers, and rabbis is under way but far from completed. As a community of scholars, we need to take stock of where we have been to develop a sense of where we are going. First, I will review the extent of current knowledge about clergy's political *choices.* Why do some pastors seek to exercise political leadership while others regard such activity as inappropriate or futile? Second, I will pose some questions about the *conse-*

quences of political activity among clergy, about which considerably less is known. What effects do the leadership efforts of pastors have?

Clergy's Political Choices

Any account of the political activism of clergy must begin with pastors' individual characteristics. Under what circumstances do clergy exhibit the willingness and ability to attempt political leadership? There are three general sources of variation in the extent of clerical political activism: the existence of a coherent "social theology" (Guth et al. 1997), the availability of a plausible source of religious authority, and special skills that facilitate political participation.

Social Theology

First, clergy who wish to act as political leaders must perceive a connection between their pastoral work and the more secular world of politics. Guth and his colleagues (1997) have termed this connection "social theology." Social theologies combine a sense of the essential religious purposes of ministry with a clear conception of the political. Under what circumstances do theological meanings assume an importance in the public, authoritative world of politics?

Traditionally, politicized piety has been a characteristic of theological liberals. The tradition of the Social Gospel, with its emphasis on making the Scriptures relevant to contemporary circumstances, has provided theologically (and often politically) liberal clergy with a straightforward rationale for becoming involved in politics (Guth et al. 1997; Quinley 1974). In the vocabulary of Benson and Williams (1982), such a politically engaged Christianity flows from a theology that is both "communal" (as opposed to individualistic) and "horizontal" (primarily concerned with ethical matters). Stark and Glock (1968) have noted that there is a negative relationship between religious orthodoxy and "ethicalism," so it is not surprising that political activism often has been associated with theological and political liberalism.

In the past several decades, however, and periodically during other periods in American history (Wilcox 1992), theological conservatives also have been engaged in political activism. These conservative religious activists have en-

countered many formidable obstacles to their political participation. Not only have they been constrained by the pervasive individualism of the American political culture and the constitutional value of church-state separation, but their activism has been limited by theological considerations as well. Many evangelical Protestant churches promote a Christian theology that is both "vertical" and "agentic," which means that evangelical ministers traditionally have been most concerned with questions of individual salvation. Only incidentally do many of them become interested in broader political matters (Jelen 1993). This "otherworldly" orientation among evangelical Protestants often has served to suppress the extent and effectiveness of attempts to mobilize religious conservatives.

In recent years, religious conservatives have increased the amount and efficacy of their political activity to the point that the participation gap between theological liberals and conservatives has narrowed. In part, this change may be attributable to the public articulation of a rationale for religious activity that is relatively congruent with the dominant political culture. If religious forces hope to be taken seriously in the politics of a nation that espouses the legal separation of church and state, they must frame their efforts in ways that reflect the American cultural emphases on *individualism* and *freedom.*

Historically there has been no shortage of rationales for religiously motivated political activity (for an overview, see Jelen 1991). Such justifications have included the notion that the United States is a "Christian nation" that has a special relationship with God.[1] For example, Jerry Falwell has argued that the fate of the United States is in some sense contingent on its collective relationship with the Almighty: "Psalm 9:17 admonishes, 'The Wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.' America will be no exception. If she forgets God, she too will face His wrath and judgment like every other nation in the history of humanity. But we have the promise in Psalm 33:12, which declares, 'Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD.' When a nation's ways please the Lord, that nation is blessed with supernatural help" (Falwell 1980, 24). Such "covenant theology," however, has not been well received in all circles, which is part of the reason why older manifestations of the Christian Right, such as the Moral Majority and Pat Robertson's 1988 presidential campaign, were ultimately unsuccessful (Buell and Sigelman 1985, 1987; Green 1993; Sigelman, Wilcox, and Buell 1987; Wilcox 1987).

But more recent manifestations of the Christian Right, such as the Chris-

tian Coalition, have put forth a rationale for political activity by "people of faith" that emphasizes the importance of the free exercise of religion. As Ralph Reed, former executive director of the Christian Coalition, has put it, "The [Christian Right] movement is best understood as an essentially defensive struggle by people seeking to sustain their faith and their values. . . . Presumably all of us want freedom to practice our religion, to enjoy the rights to free speech guaranteed by the first amendment, and to fully participate in our duties of citizenship. Yet intolerance toward religion has reached disturbing levels, threatening civility and undermining a basic sense of fairness" (Reed 1994, 18, 41). Concern about religious free exercise has never been far from the rhetoric of politically conservative Christians. What distinguishes their recent religious political activism, however, is the emphasis on free exercise to the virtual exclusion of other, more "authoritative" considerations. In a chapter entitled "The 'Christian Nation' and Other Horrors," Stephen Carter writes, "Our secular politics is unlikely to become the servant of any single religious tradition; the nation has become too secure in its diversity to allow that travesty to occur. But it is quite possible for religion to become the servant of secular politics, and, in the 1980s, some would say, it nearly did" (Carter 1993, 97).

The importance of this shift in emphasis cannot be overemphasized. Falwell was preoccupied with "the rise and fall of empires" (which is the title of the chapter in which the passage quoted above appears). More recent observers like Reed and Carter, though, have argued that the real problem in church-state relations is that Caesar has usurped functions that rightfully belong to God. In the language of the schoolyard, "they (the government) started it" (see Morken 1994). This rhetorical shift is important because free exercise concerns are quite consonant with the individualistic character of the American political culture. A focus on *rights* rather than *obligations* makes the claims of religious activists more plausible to people outside the movement (Glendon 1991). So reports about increased political activism on the part of conservative clergy (Guth et al. 1997) are not at all surprising. Perhaps as a consequence of this more individualist warrant for political activism, the Christian Coalition has had much more success in attracting supporters from a variety of faith traditions than did earlier Christian Right organizations such as the Moral Majority (see Wilcox, Rozell, and Gunn, 1996).

Certain Christian Right issues (such as school prayer and tuition vouch-

ers) are admittedly easy to characterize in the rhetoric of free exercise or individualism. But some theological conservatives have been equal to the challenge of blending their moral agenda into the language of individual rights. For example, Morken (1994) has argued that statutes designed to protect gays and lesbians from discrimination in housing or employment might well violate the free exercise clause in that they force people of faith into economic or social interaction with people whose "lifestyles" they see as an "abomination." Similarly, Grindstaff (1994) has shown that pro-life rhetoric was less religious and more secular in the years between *Roe* v. *Wade* (1973) and *Webster* v. *Reproductive Health Services* (1989). Rather than invoking religious warrants such as biblical passages or natural law explanations, opponents of legal abortion have begun to focus on the identity of fetuses as "persons" bearing "rights" deserving of legal protection.

More generally, moral issues have been subsumed under the rubric of free exercise via the rhetorical device of "family values." It is often argued that whatever else "free exercise of religion" might mean, it clearly includes people's right to raise their children in the faith of their choice. To the extent that secular authorities undermine parents' ability to inculcate religious values in their children, their free exercise rights may be at risk. Thus, if the government requires interaction with homosexuals, or insists that openly gay teachers be available as role models, or mandates the teaching of evolution in public school, then it has compromised the free exercise of religion. Indeed, it is perhaps no accident that many issues involving morality or church-state separation concern public education, which is arguably both coercive and directed at people who are incapable of meaningful consent (children).

Moreover, the availability of an activist social theology may vary along the dimension of "ecumenism-particularism." Given the incredible diversity of American Christianity (indeed, of American religion generally), effective political activism requires a given religious group to cooperate with others. A large body of literature (Green 1993; Jelen 1991; Reed 1994; Wilcox 1992) clearly shows that the effectiveness of earlier Christian Right organizations was limited by their religious particularism. The Moral Majority and the Robertson presidential campaign were largely unwilling to reach out to people of all religious backgrounds for support, so they were unable to expand their influence beyond a relatively limited denominational and doctrinal base. More recent Christian Right groups have done a better job of establishing a broad base

of support. For example, in his book *Politically Incorrect,* Ralph Reed (1994) devotes considerable space and attention to the evangelical legacies of anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism, which Reed himself has sought to overcome. Also, Christian Right groups recently have shifted their emphasis from matters of doctrine to religious free exercise and family issues.

Some empirical evidence shows that the Christian Right has in fact taken major steps toward ecumenism. Wilcox, Rozell, and Gunn (1996) show that at the mass level the Christian Coalition is more religiously inclusive than was the Moral Majority. Guth and colleagues (1997) provide strong evidence that doctrinal cleavages among Protestant clergy (corresponding to a religious "two-party system") have largely superseded the denominationally based cleavages of the past (Wuthnow 1988). Nevertheless, the question of whether religious particularism inhibits religiously motivated political activism is still unsettled.

Religious activists' ability to overcome the debilitating effects of particularism depends on a capacity to overcome deep doctrinal (and perhaps ethnic) divisions. A genuinely ecumenical coalition of the orthodox (Hunter 1991) would require cooperation not only between fundamentalists and Pentecostals (who have traditionally been at odds) but also between evangelical Christians and conservative Catholics, Muslims, and Mormons.[2] While such a diverse coalition of moral traditionalists is certainly not inconceivable, this sort of broad religious cooperation has not yet taken hold.[3]

Many clergy are also reluctant or unwilling to form ecumenical coalitions. Finke and Stark (1992) have argued that religious denominations can be compared to firms in an economy in that they perform "better" and are more attentive to the desires of their "customers" in religiously *competitive* environments. To extend the economic analogy, a pastor who seeks to increase the membership of his or her congregation may have an incentive to engage in "product differentiation." Such a pastor would want to *emphasize* the differences that set his or her religious tradition and congregation apart from others (see Jelen 1995). And there may be a great deal of tension between the demands of political activism (in which it may be desirable to *minimize* differences with potential allies) and religious recruitment (which may require the *magnification* of differences). Bearing in mind that religious congregations are not *primarily* political organizations, the requisites of political participation may seem rather costly in terms of other ministerial goals. In any event,

the extent of and effects of religious particularism vary. Future research should address the circumstances under which ecumenical coalitions are likely to succeed or fail.

Theological Authority

A second variable that accounts for variation in the extent to which clergy engage in politics concerns the theological authority that pastors can bring to bear on their political activism. Churches, after all, are voluntary organizations whose members have the option of leaving if they feel discontented (see especially Roof and McKinney 1987). Why should clergy believe that their congregation members might find their pronouncements authoritative, or even plausible? Here we might expect to observe substantial differences among religious traditions. For example, the Catholic hierarchy continues to regard its pronouncements as authoritative, and the American Catholic bishops have been quite active in American politics over the past two decades (Byrnes 1991; Segers 1995). A growing body of empirical research has shown, however, that the *effects* of Catholic social and political teaching on the attitudes of lay Catholics are weak and inconsistent (Jelen 1994b; Wald 1992). Younger generations are least likely to find the Church's teachings credible (Davidson et al. 1997; McNamara 1992). When the authority of the Catholic hierarchy is counterposed against the individualism of American culture, it is the Church's moral certitude that appears to lose out. Although the American Catholic hierarchy appears quite effective in communicating the content of its positions, its effectiveness in encouraging adherence to those viewpoints is weakening steadily.

Similarly, as I have shown elsewhere (Jelen 1993, 1994a), mainline Protestant clergy's willingness and ability to attempt political leadership has been limited because of the relatively low level of doctrinal orthodoxy they typically convey. While many mainline clergy regard the Bible as *an* authoritative source, relatively few regard the Scriptures as inerrant or infallible. This has tended to mean that mainline ministers have lacked credible justifications for their issue positions. Their congregations often dismiss their pronouncements as mere "opinion." Some mainline clergy are well aware of this limitation and are therefore reluctant to attempt political socialization in public ministerial settings (Jelen 1993). Moreover, some mainline clergy have expressed a strong commitment to individualism and a corresponding reluc-

tance to try to influence their congregations' judgments on political matters. Even though the *content* of mainline clergy's theological views would seem to predispose them for political leadership, their theological *methodology* may render political activity difficult (see Welch et al. 1993).

Relative to Catholic and mainline Protestant clergy, the style of evangelical ministry is a powerful political resource for doctrinally conservative clergy. Kellstedt (1989) has argued that the defining characteristic of evangelicalism is a "high" view of Scripture, in which the Bible is variously regarded as a literal, inerrant, or infallible source of truth (see also Kellstedt and Smidt 1993). To the extent that clergy and laity share a belief in an authoritative Bible, evangelical clergy have a powerful justification for making political pronouncements in public settings. Provided that the connection between their pronouncements and Scripture is at least plausible, evangelical ministers are well positioned to teach the political implications of shared faith commitments. Despite this politically helpful *methodology,* however, evangelical pastors traditionally have shunned political activity because of the *content* of their theology, which is individualistic and focused on personal salvation. On the other hand, Guth and colleagues (1997) argue that many evangelical clergy now accept the legitimacy of political activism. Their use of biblical authority may render their leadership quite effective.

Political Skills

Clergy vary in the extent to which they possess political skills that are relevant to social and political activism. Traditionally this has been an area in which evangelical clergy have been somewhat disadvantaged relative to their Catholic and mainline counterparts, since evangelicals have tended to be educated in less prestigious institutions and exhibit lower overall levels of educational attainment (Guth et al. 1997, 55). But this apparent disadvantage may be relatively unimportant. Recent research (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995) has shown that religious participation is an important source of political skills, and that such political learning is especially likely to take place in relatively egalitarian, "low church" congregations. Thus it is quite possible that evangelicalism itself may compensate for the relatively weak educational resources of some evangelical clergy.[4] Further, evangelical clergy have tended to focus political attention on issues of personal morality such as abortion, gay rights, and feminism (Jelen 1993; Welch et al. 1993). Such issues exemplify the

notion of "easy issues" put forward by Carmines and Stimson (1980) in that forming opinions about them does not require high levels of cognitive sophistication.[5] As such, evangelical pastors may find it relatively easy to exert political leadership as compared to clergy in other religious traditions.

Moreover, recent trends in politics and technology may have reduced the costs of political participation substantially. Matthew Moen (1992) has noted that the Christian Right has undergone the process of institutionalization; its basis now lies in relatively stable interest groups and activities. Christian Right groups such as the Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, the Catholic Alliance, and Focus on the Family provide a communications network and other resources that facilitate political activity. Similarly, technological advances like desktop publishing, e-mail, and the Internet have substantially reduced the costs of activism. As such tools become increasingly accessible to the mass public, the exercise of political influence may become more egalitarian. In any event, the ability to engage in political discourse is an important resource for clergy, and it varies across individuals, denominations, and time periods. Indeed, in chapter 3 James Guth directs our attention to the effects of socialization on individual ministers. As evangelical churches become less distinctive demographically (Roof and McKinney 1987), future pastors grow up in religious and family environments where it is easier to acquire efficacious attitudes about political activism.

Consequences of Political Activism

Political activism among clergy becomes even more interesting if their activism has an effect on public policy outcomes or their congregations' political attitudes and behavior. Clergy can choose to play a variety of political roles. They can mobilize or inhibit political participation by others. They can choose to set forth a political agenda for others to consider. They can become political activists themselves. Assessing clergy's effectiveness in such roles is among the more impressive challenges in social science. The difficulty of measuring "influence" is one of the hardy perennial questions of political science. For example, it is possible to imagine at least three processes that might account for correspondence between the political attitudes of clergy and their congregations. First, it may be that the pastor's leadership efforts are in fact successful, and that congregation members follow his or her cues. Second, since churches

are voluntary organizations, it may be that church members select religious environments in which their preferred values are expressed (see Welch et al. 1993). Finally, clergy may anticipate the political preferences of their congregations and provide reinforcing political cues in the service of other congregational goals (such as attracting and retaining members).

I will confine my attention to the effects of pastors' political activism *within* their congregations. This is not to suggest that clergy do not participate or attempt to exert political influence in other arenas. They can help to set the political agenda and influence policy outcomes by participating directly as citizens, public leaders, and activists (Byrnes 1991; Hertzke 1988). My focus, however, will be on the unique role clergy play as "opinion leaders" in specialized settings and with unconventional political resources.

While the methodological difficulties of sorting out various causal mechanisms are beyond the scope of this chapter, it is possible to impose conceptual order upon the various leadership roles that clergy assume. The political roles that clergy assume within their congregations can be considered analogous to the role of "prophet" in the Hebrew Scriptures. Prophets, as opposed to evangelists, were charged with the task of reminding the people of their shared commitment to certain values ("the Covenant") and calling them to task for failure to believe or act in accordance with those values.[6] Similarly, modern pastors can serve as effective agents of political learning to the extent that they can call upon a common set of shared values with political implications.

The most obvious (and in practical terms the most difficult) act of such leadership is *conversion*. When a pastor seeks to persuade the congregation of the correctness of a political position with which some members may disagree, he or she is attempting to convert them on the basis of shared religious convictions. For example, a pastor who is liberal on racial matters may attempt to persuade her congregation of the desirability of integration or affirmative action—even when such positions are unpopular among the laity. This example would be a classic case of political leadership. But such direct attempts are quite rare and generally unsuccessful because they bring high costs for the minister and may be rejected by the congregation (see the discussion of mainline clergy in Jelen 1993). Indeed, this is precisely the problem raised a generation ago by Jeffrey Hadden (1969) in his seminal work, *The Gathering Storm in the Churches.*

To illustrate, I (Jelen 1993) found that a sizable number of mainline clergy regarded themselves (correctly) as more liberal than their congregations, which were often reluctant to confront political values that the ministers might have regarded as un-Christian. I remember particularly vividly the Presbyterian minister who called himself "the gutless wonder" for his unwillingness to confront the racism of his congregation (which was located in a town reputed to be a center of activity for the Ku Klux Klan). He was acutely aware of the precarious economic position of his ministry, and he experienced profound guilt for having succumbed to the combination of political and economic pressure.

A second leadership process is *agenda setting.* Clergy may attempt to lead their congregations' political attitudes, particularly on "safe" issues that inspire little active resistance. Laity are often unaware or unconcerned about such issues. Agenda setting can involve pointing out the religious implications of matters that might otherwise seem purely secular. For example, in the course of my research I have heard several evangelical ministers denounce New Age culture and consciousness as anti-Christian and antibiblical. Members of these ministers' congregations did not seem to be practicing idolatry self-consciously but appeared to regard New Age publications and media as forms of psychotherapy, with few, if any, theological overtones. More generally, lay people's tendency to compartmentalize their religious beliefs may be quite common (see Casanova 1994), so it may be especially important for clergy to extend the scope of the sacred to other aspects of their lives that are not explicitly religious, including politics.

Clergy may also play a role best described as *reinforcement.* Clergy whose congregations are in general political agreement with them "preach to the converted," but they may also seek to increase the *intensity* of their congregations' political preferences. If such intensification results in political activity on the part of the laity, reinforcement becomes *mobilization.* Thus clergy may provide guidance, information, or resources that encourage political participation.

Finally, Verba and colleagues (1995) have discussed the process of *empowerment.* This refers to latent political socialization, in which congregation members acquire political skills and resources from participation in congregational activities. Even if the content of clergy's communication is manifestly apolitical, church experiences can provide a basis for lay participation in more

secular public affairs (see Peterson 1992). Activities such as serving on a church committee, teaching Sunday school, or attempting to recruit new members to the congregation can have profound educative consequences that need not be confined to the congregation. Indeed, empowerment may be one of religion's most important political functions. Church participation is among the very few agents of political socialization that imparts political skills to citizens who are otherwise politically disadvantaged.

Under what circumstances are clergy's attempts at political socialization likely to be successful? Several sources of pastoral credibility have emerged in the literature. Again, one of these sources is the availability of an authoritative (or at least persuasive) theological warrant. Lay members must perceive a clear, plausible connection between their religious beliefs and the political judgment the pastor is attempting to promote. Some ministers may be reluctant to provide such cues for theological or political reasons. Thus political socialization may be an area where evangelical clergy who are willing to attempt political leadership have distinct advantages because of their commitment to a "high" view of Scripture.

The credibility of clerical messages may also be contingent on some sense of cultural congruence. Presumably relatively few congregations constitute isolated, self-contained communities that are impervious to the influence of outside, secular forces (see Ammerman 1987). Religious messages that do not contradict basic secular values (such as individualism) are much more likely to be received positively than are messages that place congregation members at odds with the dominant culture. It is rhetorically powerful for clergy to cast an issue like school prayer as "voluntary prayer" or the teaching of creationism in public schools as "equal treatment," because doing so may mobilize supporters and neutralize opponents (Jelen 1998a).

Third, Wald, Owen, and Hill (1990) have noted that political socialization seems much more effective in "cohesive" churches where there are few political differences. While it is not clear whether such cohesion is a cause or a consequence of effective ministerial socialization, such congregations may well be more fertile sources for agenda setting or mobilization by clergy. In politically homogeneous congregations, the potential costs of political activism by clergy would be minimized, which would tend to advantage evangelical clergy.

Finally, the success of political leadership by clergy may well be a function of the broader context in which the congregation exists. In particular, some

scholars (Cook, Jelen, and Wilcox 1993; Chandler et al. 1994; Jelen and Wilcox 1998; Smidt 1983) have made the argument that religious socialization is most effective in minority settings. The political consequences of religious teaching are enhanced when the congregation's religious identity is distinct from that of other members of the community. Thus, groups such as Catholics in the South, evangelicals in the cities of the Northeast, and Mormons outside of the West may be relatively easy to mobilize for political action. Future research should examine the political roles played by clergy in religious minority groups of all varieties.

The propositions outlined above should be seen as suggestions for further research. Congregational reactions to pastoral political leadership are likely to vary across contexts, congregations, and religious traditions. A useful theory of political activism among clergy needs to account for such differences.

In democratic societies like the United States, preachers of "the Word" often possess an impressive array of political resources, but they also operate under substantial political, cultural, and theological constraints. As such, the political roles of clergy can be expected to vary across time, place, and congregation.

This apparent variation seems to me to be a *substantive finding* rather than a problem of inadequate theory or research. Religious leadership constitutes a "slack" political resource (Dahl 1961) whose mobilization is ultimately dependent on circumstances that lie outside of the religious realm. Therefore religion may be a *reactive* force in democratic politics that is activated in response to changes in the external environment. Moreover, the different levels and styles of political activism also reflect the stubborn diversity of religion in the United States, which confounds our efforts to produce general, parsimonious theories of ministerial political leadership (see Jelen 1998b). The dual tasks of "rendering unto Caesar" and "rendering unto God" are quite complex, owing to the existence of considerable overlap between the two realms.

Thus, those who conduct future research about clergy in politics face three rather daunting tasks. First, we need to account for the choices made by clergy. Why do some pastors attempt political leadership, while others do not? Why are some types of participation more common within particular religious traditions than others? Second, what are the specific consequences of clergy's leadership for political learning in congregations? Why do the political rami-

fications of church membership seem to vary across contexts, traditions, and congregations? Finally, what consequences does political activism by clergy have on public policy? As students of religion and politics, we may need to broaden our scope by connecting the political activity of religious leaders to the actions of legislatures, executives, and bureaucracies.

3 Reflections on the Status of Research on Clergy in Politics

JAMES L. GUTH

The study of clergy as politicians is back in vogue, reflecting the heightened influence of organized religion in American political life and scholars' curiosity about its institutional leaders. In chapter 2, Ted Jelen moves us toward a more comprehensive theoretical formulation for organizing the clergy-and-politics literature and for guiding future research. And much new research is needed. Even in the most recent work, scholars have often raised more questions than they have answered. They have also neglected important groups of clergy and ignored new approaches to the study of political participation. My purpose here is not to duplicate Jelen's observations but instead to focus on several neglected aspects of social science research that—if investigated—would provide us with insight into the political choices clergy make and a better understanding of the consequences of their political activity. Not only are clergy significant political actors themselves, but they also have enormous potential to influence the attitudes and actions of their congregations. Indeed, no other institutional leaders in America have constant access to so enormous a captive audience.

In this chapter, I focus on four neglected areas of research on clergy in politics. First, we need to know more about the socialization processes that influence clergy's propensity to become involved in public affairs. We also need a better sense of the types of activities in which clergy engage. Moreover, we need to know how ideological and organizational forces mobilize clergy. Finally, further research is needed on the effects that clergy have on the political process. My observations will be most directly applicable to the white Protestant traditions that I have studied, but they should also be relevant to African American and Hispanic Protestant clergy, Catholic priests, and Jewish rabbis—political actors too long neglected by social scientists.

Professional Socialization

Although scholars have studied clergy involvement in politics for more than forty years, they have paid far too little attention to the socialization processes that future clergy undergo as children and young adults. We all know about the impact of upbringing on citizens in general—political science has an entire subdiscipline devoted to the topic—but insights from that literature are seldom brought to bear on the study of clergy in politics. There is also an immense literature on the professional training of clergy that students of clergy in politics usually ignore. Although almost none of this research is by political scientists or addresses our concerns directly, this body of work provides useful insights about the childhood socialization, career choice, and professional training of pastors.

Like other citizens, clergy are oriented toward politics by childhood experience, all of which is beyond our direct observation. Their political socialization no doubt varies in part with differences in social class background. Historically, mainline Protestant clergy were drawn from the middle class, that is, from among the politically active social strata. So family experience might predispose some clergy toward maintaining their parents' levels of political interest and activity. Middle-class backgrounds might also foster personal skills and resources that facilitate political involvement. On the other hand, until recently evangelical clergy have come predominantly from rural, working-class families with comparatively less political interest and fewer opportunities for involvement. Although my own surveys (Guth et al. 1997) include no direct questions about parental politics, scores of write-in comments from active clergy point out the influence of family history: "My daddy was a city council member"; "my mother sat on the school board"; "my family was always political." Such volunteered comments reveal something that we should know: parental interest and involvement may influence clergy's later political engagement—or lack thereof (see Jennings and Niemi 1981). We would be well advised to explore these influences.

Clergy also differ in their motivations for joining the profession, which in turn may shape their political orientations. Whatever the political experiences of their parents, there is little doubt that prospective clergy respond to different incentives from those drawn to other professions—incentives that may

vary by denomination, ethnicity, or historical period. Indeed, within a few years of entering the ministry, clergy's expectations have often settled into firm role orientations (Nelsen and Baxter 1981; Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke 1980).

There is evidence, for example, that many young people who were attracted to mainline Protestant vocations in the 1960s saw the church as a vehicle for social reform (Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974). Indeed, although some of the most activist clergy in this age cohort have now left the profession, those who remain still constitute the most active of all modernist clergy (Guth et al. 1997). Concern with social reform was overtaken in the 1980s by a more therapeutic set of incentives as young people (and growing numbers of second-career seminarians) entered the pastorate to help people adjust to the stresses of modern life. This professional orientation might well be connected to somewhat lower levels of political interest among mainline clergy. Evangelical Protestantism, on the other hand, traditionally drew its clergy from those with an apolitical or even antipolitical desire to save souls for the Lord (Jelen 1993), but now some of its aspirants espouse a broader vision for "reclaiming society."

The results of psychological batteries administered to seminary entrants indirectly support these conjectures about clergy's incentives. Such batteries trace the changing personality traits, career goals, and social attitudes of seminary entrants (see Zikmund, Lummis, and Chang 1998). Thus, what clergy do (or do not do) in politics is often a reflection of the types of people who are attracted to the profession.

Regardless of their familial socialization and reasons for entering the pastorate, clergy in different religious traditions are routed through vastly different educational experiences. Class background, church experience, and denominational context, not to mention a host of idiosyncratic personal factors, also contribute to clergy's different socialization experiences. Some evangelical and nonwhite clergy, of course, still have limited access to advanced education. Nonetheless, education's influence on clergy's approaches to politics is pervasive. In writing *The Bully Pulpit,* we were continually fascinated by education's powerful effects on clergy attitudes and behavior (Guth et al. 1997). First, college education has a considerable impact in the directions that one might expect. Prospective mainline Protestant clergy tend to matriculate either in denominational colleges or selective private liberal arts colleges. Future evangelical clergy tend to attend their own denominational colleges, Bible colleges,

or less selective state universities. At least part of the political liberalism of mainline clergy originates in instruction by the liberal faculty of the undergraduate institutions they attend, whereas evangelical conservatism is fostered in evangelical colleges—or left intact by large public educational institutions.

Prospective clergy are also shaped by their choice of undergraduate academic majors. Mainline clergy spread themselves widely over the traditional humanities and, in the past two decades, in the social and behavioral sciences as well. As Conrad Cherry recently observed, education in elite university-related divinity schools has "always built on the liberal arts disciplines in the humanities and the social sciences" (1995, 178). Such consistent exposure no doubt conveys some of the dominant political liberalism of those disciplines (Ladd and Lipset 1975) to future mainline clergy. It may also create something of a gulf between their own liberal arts orientation and the more practical educational bent of many parishioners. Evangelical clergy have rather different disciplinary preferences. They choose majors that either focus very narrowly on religion (such as the Bible) or lie entirely outside of the field. Oftentimes they study the very same subjects as some of their better-educated congregation members. For example, many Southern Baptist clergy majored in business administration, education, music, or technical and applied fields. Such majors are unlikely to undermine the conservative predisposition that many future evangelical clergy bring with them to college (and may well reinforce it). In any case, such majors will provide the organizational and cognitive skills necessary for effective political activity.

If both college type and field of study produce diverging political orientations in mainline and evangelical pastors, their subsequent theological training reinforces these tendencies. No one who has read the wonderful recent ethnography (Carroll et al. 1997) of the two pseudonymous "Evangelical" and "Mainline" seminaries will doubt that the denizens of these seminaries were already quite distinct upon matriculation, but they graduated with even more divergent orientations toward the political world. As my colleagues and I have shown in *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997), the site of theological training does differentiate ministers politically. Clergy with degrees from the most prestigious university-related divinity schools (whatever their denomination), or from highly ranked nondenominational seminaries, were invariably most liberal politically—and most disposed to political action (see Cherry 1995, 185–212; Goldman 1991). And as the work of Carroll and colleagues

(1997) shows, the best mainline seminaries also foster social and political liberalism and a propensity toward activism. Explicit formation of pastoral politics has been less intentional at evangelical seminaries, but this is changing at Southern Baptist, Assemblies of God, and some nondenominational institutions (Bryan 1991).

Thus, early socialization has a marked impact not only on clergy's political attitudes and affiliations but also on their propensity for activism. Higher educational attainment (in particular) not only shapes attitudes but enhances political interest, produces a sense of political efficacy, shapes views on the propriety of activism, and hones skills in addressing social and political issues (see Guth et al. 1997, 138–61). Given the increasing educational attainments of conservatives, most of these predisposing factors have been equalized for conservative and liberal clergy in recent years, accounting for growing activity on both sides of the theological and political spectrum.

Of course, as Roberta Sigel (1989) has reminded us, political socialization does not end with adulthood and entry into a profession. Like all citizens, clergy continue to learn about politics from their own experiences, from continued reading and reflection, and from interaction in their communities and religious organizations. Such learning may have varying effects. Some "New Breed" clergy-activists of the 1960s were frustrated by their failure to change public policies and intimidated by conservative laity. They either withdrew into private concerns or left the ministry (Quinley 1974, 1–21). In the same vein, the experiences of some Christian Right clergy have led them to leave politics, sometimes out of disappointment, but often because they have developed new perspectives on the social role of the church (see Dobson 1996). Other conservative clergy have been energized by their achievements and have acquired more positive attitudes about political activism (Russo and Knapp 1994). In any case, scholars must determine what clergy learn from their professional experiences and how such learning affects their political activity.

Research about childhood socialization, recruitment to the ministry, educational training, and professional socialization are especially relevant to another vital topic: the influence of gender. In recent years the mainline Protestant pastoral corps has been increasingly diversified as women make up a growing proportion of pastors and seminary students (Chaves 1997). Scholars have just begun to assess the impact of these trends on churches and denominations. Most are still preoccupied with charting women clergy's career

experiences, especially the obstacles they confront on the road to full professional equality (Zikmund, Lummis, and Chang 1998). Fewer have addressed systematically the question of how "feminization" will affect the clergy's social and political life. Some scholars argue that women are more ideologically and politically engaged than are their male counterparts, but others contend that they are no different on these counts (see Ice 1987; Lehman 1993).

An essay by Hunter and Sargeant (1993), who hypothesize that clergy feminization will exacerbate the contemporary "culture wars," offers the only sustained speculation on this point. Arguing from the evident radicalism of prominent female theologians and religious activists, Hunter and Sargeant assert that the female pastors of the future will bolster support for liberal policies within the Protestant mainline. Our own brief comparison (Guth et al. 1994) of male and female clergy in the late 1980s revealed a mixed picture, but one that tends to support Hunter and Sargeant's argument. In the four mainline churches we studied, women were indeed more liberal both theologically and politically than were men. The gender gaps are quite large in one denomination (the United Methodist Church), moderate in another (the Disciples of Christ), and small in the other two (the Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.] and the Reformed Church in America). Most differences disappeared, however, when we controlled for age and educational background. Still, given the rapid increase in female clergy in the past decade and the proliferation of gender-related issues on the national agenda, future clergy studies must address the effects of this transition.

These socialization factors—parental influences, educational experiences, professional learning, and gender influences—require much more analysis. We have missed the bulk of the iceberg in determining which clergy are most likely to become (and remain) politically active. Most of the factors that predispose clergy to political activity—their interest in politics, ideological commitments, social theology, and role orientations—are present long before contemporary influences such as social context, congregational attitudes, and organizational mobilization can have their effect.

What Political Activity?

Another gap in the literature on clergy in politics is the absence of any full taxonomy of clergy's political activities, much less a conceptual map of their

participation. This defect simply magnifies a fundamental flaw of the political-participation literature more generally. Indeed, as institutional leaders, important community figures, and educated professionals, clergy have access to many more political options than does the average citizen. Any close reader of the popular and religious press must be impressed with the range—and often the ingenuity—of the political action that clergy take, not all of which is tapped effectively by most surveys. Survey researchers must inevitably choose relatively few items to represent this intimidating array of political activities. In making these choices, survey researchers have been influenced by many factors: the contemporary political agenda and favored styles of activism, the necessity of using "convenience samples," their own interests and attitudes, and scholarly fashion. The resulting batteries of questions often fail to tap either the form or issue foci of clergy's political activity.

Early studies concentrated on a limited range of activities, primarily those entailing "church leadership," with the addition of unconventional "protest leadership," such as antiwar marches and civil disobedience. Protest actions were highly visible in the 1960s and viewed sympathetically by liberal scholars (Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974). Later studies inspired by the rise of the Christian Right often replicated these participation batteries but added items on types of participation emphasized by that movement, such as electoral politics and interest group involvement (Beatty and Walter 1989; Guth et al. 1991). Some analysts who were concerned with particular subsets of clergy, such as inner-city ministers, have focused on yet other kinds of involvement, especially at the local level (see Day chapter 6 for an excellent example). In much the same way, the choice of issue focus has varied. Scholars in the 1960s were interested in clergy's responses to the issues of civil rights, the Vietnam War, and the fight against poverty. This agenda was broadened in the 1980s by issues raised by the Christian Right, such as abortion, gay rights, and cultural issues. And more recently, other scholars have focused on clergy campaigns for community development or fighting crime (Wood 1997).

Our interest in specific kinds of political acts and issues often controls our results: we can find participation only where we look for it. If giving a sermon decrying poverty or marching against the Vietnam War constituted participation in the 1960s, it is understandable that scholars heard only "sounds of silence" among conservative clergy, who regarded political sermons and civil disobedience as improper political involvement and often took the other side

on these issues (Koller and Retzer 1980; Stark 1980). On the other hand, if holding prayer vigils outside abortion clinics or checking out pornographic library books and refusing to return them constitutes our definition of political participation, our research will make it appear that conservative clergy are politically dominant (see Hinkle 1998). If promoting community action on crime and poverty is our concern, urban clergy will appear more active than suburban or rural pastors.

Thus, we must be especially cautious in designing participation items for questionnaires or interviews. In *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997) we found several distinct "modes" of clerical participation—apologies to Verba and Nie (1972)—even within our own limited repertory. In fact, we repeatedly rebuked ourselves for not having more and better indicators for each mode, as well as measures for other untapped but empirically evident types of participation. (I hasten to add that our battery was nevertheless much more extensive than were those in previous studies.) Indeed, we were often surprised by write-in comments about activities that no previous clergy study had anticipated.

A good example is evangelical clergy's custom of praying for political candidates in public forums, a type of endorsement growing in popularity. Retrospective confirmation of our wisdom—or luck—in asking about such prayers in 1988 came in several forms. First, our later studies demonstrated the popularity of political prayers (Guth et al. 1997, 166–67; see also Guth chapter 9). In addition, Christian Coalition leader Ralph Reed found it necessary to admonish clergy against such "political prayers" (Reed 1996, 262). Even the secular press inadvertently discovered the practice. The clearest proof of our foresight was a wonderful picture in *The New York Times* of a very Catholic and very uncomfortable Pat Buchanan being blessed by a Pentecostal minister just before the 1996 Louisiana presidential primary! Our experience with this type of participation means that we should engage in a lot of ethnographic observation, constant perusal of religious news sources, and intensive interviews to remain abreast of the newest weapons in the clergy's political arsenal. Unless we do this—and even *if* we do—we must be cautious in comparing the activity levels of different types of clergy.

Ultimately, then, typologies of clerical political action must be developed that reflect both theoretical concerns and empirical reality. If our theoretical orientation tells us that clergy are opinion shapers, congregational leaders, denominational activists, and community notables, then our conception of cler-

ical activism should seek to tap the activities that are most likely among such people. Moreover, our theories and typologies should be tested carefully against the empirical reality of clerical participation.

Political Mobilization of Clergy

Once we have expanded both the activity and issue foci of clergy activism, we will be better situated to consider political mobilization, or the short-term factors that explain why and when clergy choose to interject themselves into politics. Socialization may well account for a general propensity to become involved, but such tendencies must be triggered by more immediate influences. As scholars recently have argued, such activation occurs in two forms: issue (ideological) mobilization and organizational mobilization (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). For the most part, the literature on clergy in politics has done a much better job with the former. The classic studies by Hadden (1969) and Quinley (1974) showed how issues such as civil rights, the Vietnam War, and poverty activated the "New Breed" clergy. More recent studies have demonstrated the mobilizing power of abortion, gay rights, and pornography for traditionalists. Other scholars have shown the effects of community-related issues for African American and inner city clergy (see chapters 5, 6, and 7). On the whole, scholars have done quite well in incorporating agenda mobilization into accounts of clerical involvement—in practice if not always in theory.

Such analysis encounters practical problems, of course. Agenda-driven activism tracks the issue-attention cycle and is difficult to trace, sometimes leading even careful scholars astray. Sociologist Benton Johnson (the dean of clergy studies) compared conservative clergy in Oregon in 1987 with those in his pioneering work from a quarter-century earlier (Johnson 1966, 1967, 1998). Their social concerns had changed over this period, he argued, as the orthodox abandoned their criticism of old "moral" evils such as gambling. Ironically, Johnson presented this finding in 1996 remarks to the Religious Research Association, just as gambling was reemerging as a growth area in clergy politics (Walsh 1998). Especially in the South and parts of the Midwest, clergy have been more likely in recent years to speak out on gambling than on abortion or gay rights. Thus, when incorporating political scientists' insights on issue mobilization into clergy studies, we must be mindful of the ever-changing na-

ture of local, state, and national political agendas (Beck and Jennings 1979; Kingdon 1984).

Although students of clergy in politics have attempted to address issue mobilization in general ways, they have failed to integrate organizational mobilization into their models, even though clergy are organizational animals by definition. There are partial exceptions, of course, including efforts to understand the denominational and local church context of activism. Hadden (1969) and Quinley (1974) found that the "New Breed" in the 1960s were often encouraged by denominational leaders and usually resisted by conservative laity. Others have clarified that picture somewhat by noting that in some instances political activity is *expected* of clergy, especially in evangelical and African American churches (Dobson 1996; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990, 207). Stories abound in the religious press of laity taking an issue to their pastor and asking, "What are you going to do about this?" Indeed, such congregational encouragement is often reported by pastors themselves—if not always approvingly.

Nevertheless, standard queries about denominational encouragement and congregational reaction do not take us very far. First, they do not identify the mechanisms of such influence. Take the example of denominational influence. The classic studies operationalize this variable as simple encouragement or discouragement by those in charge of clergy placement or supervision, such as bishops in the Episcopal Church or the United Methodist Church and presumably in the Catholic Church as well. (See Kelly 1989 for several examples of superiors encouraging or protecting activist priests.) Yet such analysis really fails to do justice to the full range of potential denominational influences. Major Protestant denominations such as the United Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and the Southern Baptist Convention are replete with organizational bureaucracies, internal caucuses, task forces, and individual officials desirous of mobilizing churches and clergy for political purposes (Hertzke 1988; Hofrenning 1995). We have done little, however, to connect these national forces with the actions of local religious leaders. Although some critics contend that in fact there *is* no such connection (see Chapman 1991), we cannot take this as an empirical finding without research.

Nor have we begun to map the rest of clergy's organizational world. Pastors join local ministerial alliances, community boards and committees, and (increasingly) national political organizations ranging from the liberal Bread

for the World and Interfaith Alliance to the conservative Christian Coalition and Focus on the Family (Guth et al. 1995). My 1996 study of Southern Baptist clergy showed that fully 20 percent are members of at least one conservative Christian political organization (see Guth chapter 9; Guth 1996). These clergy report high levels of political action on the precise issues on these groups' agendas. Moreover, they take their action through the mechanisms fostered by these groups. Presumably there should be even greater mobilization effects among liberal mainline clergy, who are even more prone to join extradenominational political groups (Guth et al. 1997, 169–71). The impact of *local* organizational affiliations is also largely unexplored, but such attachments, like national ties, probably have more influence on actions than on attitudes (Wood 1981, 54–56).

Finally, efforts by party organizations and candidates to mobilize clergy are extensive but uncharted. As leaders of major social institutions, clergy not only have entree to the political resources represented by their congregations but also are often political notables themselves. The Democratic Party's reliance on African American pastors during election years is hardly unique (Harris 1999; Pulley 1997; Ware 1985). In recent years some Republican officials have come to depend on Christian Right allies to activate religious leaders, but more often they have made direct advances (Nesmith 1994; Shie 1991). The extensive presidential campaign activity by Southern Baptist clergy in both 1992 and 1996, for example, is due in part to cultivation by local Republican and candidate committees. Indeed, almost exactly as many Southern Baptist ministers (50 percent) reported party contact during 1996 as received communications from the Christian Coalition and other Christian Right groups. High levels of campaign activity among liberal clergy may reflect similar attention from the Democrats. Indeed, the Democratic Party and its activists have bankrolled several campaigns to mobilize mainline clergy (Pressley 1995). In an analogous vein, some of clergy's nonlectoral activities may reflect recruitment by government or other political actors (see Crawford and Olson chapter 7).

Thus, study of the means by which clergy are activated has just begun. If we take mobilization theory seriously, we will understand much better how changes in the national and local political agendas influence the number and ideological bent of active clergy, and the ways in which denominational officials, religious interest groups, and political leaders affect clerical politics.

Measuring What Counts: Political Influence

Although there is still much to be done in delineating the political *choices* made by clergy, the most obdurate problem is discovering the *consequences* of their activity. Of course, assessing influence has always been notoriously risky, intriguing and frustrating generations of political scientists. Clergy influence is especially difficult to gauge, given the great variety of targets and the multiple possibilities for impact. Should we count pastors as influential when they mold the political attitudes of parishioners, who then translate religious values into secular politics? Or should we require that clergy actually motivate and direct that political involvement, whether through election sermons, voter guides, or personal conversation? What about a pastor's personal activity in lobbying officials, running a precinct meeting, or even serving in public office? What about public policy victories when people are actually housed or fed because of clergy efforts in the public realm?

I could go on, but my point is clear: drawing conclusions about clergy's political influence requires giving attention to different modes of activity and varied research designs to capture the impact of those specializing in each mode. Here I will make some brief comments about four kinds of influence: the long-term socializing impact of clergy on parishioners, the efficacy of clergy-led congregational mobilization, the personal activities of ministers in the political world, and the policy impact of clergy-led action.

The most recalcitrant research problem is whether and how clergy influence parishioners' social and political orientations. In chapter 2 Ted Jelen provides a valuable discussion of how such influence may occur and identifies some of the problems inherent in studying that influence. I am perhaps more pessimistic than he is about the tractability of the research problem. Clergy compete and interact with so many other agents of socialization, both within and outside the church, that it is unlikely that either experimental or survey research will help us very much in assessing the impact of individual pastors (but see Fetzer chapter 11).

Church members move frequently and expose themselves to religious messages at varying rates, and clergy are also quite mobile. Some churches feature a clear theological, social, or political identity shaped by a charismatic pastor (see chapter 13 for a wonderful illustration), but we cannot assume such situ-

ations are typical. The United Methodist Church moves its clergy in three- or four-year intervals. Ministers in other traditions are often even more peripatetic. Thus, long-term socialization effects on parishioners will typically reflect the work of several pastors serving a congregation in succession—assuming that the congregation itself is stable—or the influence of several pastors serving a mobile believer. Because clergy in the same religious tradition share basic understandings about social theology and politics, they should be expected to deliver a fairly consistent message over time that reinforces and even shapes parishioners' attitudes. But that assumption does not always answer questions about the short-term impact of particular communications, whether they are aimed at *prophetic conversion, agenda setting,* or *reinforcement* (see Jelen chapter 2).

The mobilization of parishioners to *activity,* on the other hand, is much more amenable to scientific confirmation, whether in case studies or survey research. Congregational studies (such as Cavendish chapter 13) can demonstrate how clergy motivate their church members to become involved in political action—or, just as often, fail to do so. Even survey research can delineate some of the effects that clergy have on the political activity of parishioners. In our 1996 National Survey on Religion and Politics, for example, my colleagues and I tested several propositions about the influence of religious actors, including clergy, on voter turnout and vote choice. Although we found that a sizable minority of respondents report that their clergy talk about candidates during worship services—or even endorse them—the effects of such short-term activity is not altogether clear. At the bivariate level, parishioners who hear such discussions are much more likely to vote than are those who lack this exposure (this is especially so among African American Protestants), but their candidate *choices* do not differ significantly. When other religious and secular influences are taken into account, even the impact on turnout is much reduced, suggesting that the "value added" by clergy is modest (Guth et al. 1998). Of course this is a very high standard for influence; clergy action may in fact reinforce existing predispositions in a vital way. Such findings also involve only one kind of clergy action and may not represent the efficacy of other types (like encouraging members to write letters to their U.S. senators about religious persecution in China).

Clergy are also politically active as individuals. The impact of their personal political activities could be measured—but seldom is—by techniques used in

other fields in political science, such as interest group or congressional studies. A great advance occurred when political scientists decided to interview both lobbyists and legislators to assess the influence of the former (Kingdon 1989; Milbrath 1963; Scott and Hunt 1966). In a similar way, we can ask city officials, political party leaders, legislators, and other public figures to describe or assess the impact of clergy on their decisions. This is most manageable in local case studies but can be done more broadly as well. At this point we know little about what clergy say to public officials or which issues they stress. Neither do we know whether politicians take such communications seriously, whether they cultivate individual clergy as "grassroots confidants" (see Browne 1995), or whether clergy have a natural entree to politicians who identify with their denomination (Hertzke 1988, 77–79).

Finally, we must also begin to measure the policy impact of clergy activity. Their participation in the political process may well have measurable effects on policy outcomes, especially at the local level. Are there fewer adult clubs and X-rated video stores in communities where clergy are politically active? Are there more social services available for disadvantaged groups? Is there more low-cost housing for the poor? In the future, determining the impact of clergy and churches on such policy outcomes may become even more vital as the Charitable Choice provision of the 1996 Federal Welfare Reform Act is implemented in communities around the country (Ryden 1998).

Thus, we find an enormous range of research possibilities before us. In many ways, previous research equips us to assess the factors influencing the choices clergy make, but both the political and policy consequences of their actions are much less understood. Nevertheless, we have made a beginning on both questions. Ideally, of course, we should draw on a larger scholarly perspective on the politics of professionals, one that would address many of the same intellectual issues I have discussed here. That literature has not yet appeared, however, so students of pastoral politics will have to use the studies that are available, their own theoretical understandings, and their methodological ingenuity to address the important issues of professional socialization, political activity, mobilization, and influence.

This page intentionally left blank

4 Gender and the Political Choices of Women Clergy

SUE E. S. CRAWFORD,
MELISSA M. DECKMAN, AND
CHRISTI J. BRAUN

As James L. Guth notes in chapter 3, a growing number of women are entering the clergy profession today. There is much speculation, but little data, on the possible political implications of this trend. Hunter and Sargeant (1993), for example, speculate that women clergy are more likely to have liberal political and theological views and are more likely to feel "called" to act on these beliefs. Thus they expect a large core of feminist clergy to exacerbate the "culture wars" that currently separate many conservative and progressive clergy in today's political arena.

Recent research shows that there are important theological and political differences between male and female clergy. Guth and colleagues (1994) found women clergy in the Disciples of Christ (Christian Church), United Methodist Church, and Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) to be significantly more liberal (both politically and theologically), more supportive of local action, and more likely to express concern for social action than their male counterparts. A recent study of male and female seminary students (Finlay 1997) reports that the female students were more liberal on the issue of abortion not only than the male students but than the general public. Survey data indicate that women clergy in mainline Protestant traditions are more liberal than lay women in similar religious traditions, which means that the differences between male and female clergy are not simply a reflection of gender differences in the general population (Fowler, Hertzke, and Olson 1999).

These findings show that some aspects of the experience of being a female minister lead women clergy (at least in mainline Protestant denominations) to hold liberal political attitudes. These studies, however, say little about what aspects of the experiences of women clergy affect and shape their political views, or whether and how women clergy's liberal attitudes translate into action on behalf of liberal causes.

This chapter uses qualitative analysis to explore how the gender-related experiences of women clergy affect their political attitudes and choices. We examine the ways in which gender experiences affect the political issues that concern women clergy most. We continue by exploring women clergy's perceptions of their gender as a constraint or an asset for political action. We do not mean to imply that gender experiences are the only factors or even the most important factors that influence the political attitudes and choices of women clergy. But these understudied gender-related experiences contribute to clergy mobilization and to the choices clergy make about whether to try mobilizing their congregations for political action.

Our investigation of gender influences on clergy speaks to three of this volume's themes: mobilization, context, and socialization. We thus lay the groundwork for richer analysis of clergy mobilization. Specifically, we identify the types of issues that are likely to mobilize women clergy and some of the barriers that prevent them from being mobilized. We explore the roles they play in mobilizing their congregations. We also consider the advantages that women clergy's gender may provide for their own mobilization and their ability to recruit members of their congregations for political action.

The context in which women clergy make political choices is interesting because they do so in a professional setting in which they are clearly a minority. According to the 1990 occupational census, only 10 percent of American clergy are female (Chang 1997). The minority status of women in this profession is exacerbated by long-standing religious norms about appropriate gender roles, which have been used to challenge both the ordination and the acceptance of women clergy (Chaves 1997; Zikmund, Lummis, and Chang 1998). In such a context, it is reasonable to expect female clergy to feel that they face significant constraints. Our analysis demonstrates that women clergy's potentially contested position within their religious traditions has interesting implications not only in terms of *constraints* but also in terms of *assets.* Their minority status also has an effect on the political issues that matter most to women clergy. In addition, we consider the effects of the contexts created by the cities in which these women live on the issues they care about and their perceptions of gender-related political constraints and assets.

Women's explanations of how gender affects their political choices offer an opportunity to search for effects of gender-based socialization. The socialization of women clergy begins with childhood socialization into gender roles

and continues with adult socialization into family roles (Sapiro 1983). Women clergy are further socialized in seminary and later in congregational settings. Undoubtedly this socialization process has interesting political implications for how women clergy define what it means to be a woman, what it means to be a woman minister, and how these self-definitions influence their political choices. We focus primarily on how self-definitions of gender affect women clergy's perceptions about which political issues are most important and their capabilities and limitations in addressing those issues. Thus our analysis examines the end result of socialization more than the socialization process itself.

Data and Method

Our analysis is based on in-depth interviews with 31 women clergy in Omaha, Nebraska, and Washington, D.C. The sample includes Jewish rabbis in the Conservative and Reform traditions and ministers who serve in six mainline Protestant denominations: the American Baptist Churches, the Disciples of Christ, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and the United Methodist Church.[1] All women in the sample, then, serve in religious traditions that accept modernity and theological liberalism (Roof and McKinney 1987). Clergy serving in these Protestant traditions tend to adopt liberal political agendas that focus on social justice issues (Guth et al. 1997). All the women we interviewed held congregational positions and had been in the ministry for at least three months.[2] We chose to interview women serving in congregations so that we could focus on the political decisions of female clergy who must balance political activities with ministry to, and acceptance by, a congregation. In terms of professional placement, the Washington, D.C., and Omaha samples are similar. Almost half of the women in each city serve in associate positions, and only one or two women serve in senior positions. All but three of the women are white, and all serve white or ethnically mixed congregations.

The Omaha women include one Jewish rabbi, four Lutheran pastors, six United Methodists, four Presbyterians, and one Disciple of Christ. The response rate for the Omaha sample was 100 percent—all of the women we contacted agreed to the interview. The Washington-area women include three Jewish rabbis, three American Baptist ministers, three United Methodists,

three Presbyterians, one Disciple of Christ, and two Episcopalians. The response rate for Washington-area women was 75 percent.

The cities where these women clergy work may influence the ways in which gender shapes their political choices. Women working in cities where cultural norms are more conservative may find their gender more constraining than would women who work in cities with more liberal cultural norms. The Washington metropolitan area is larger than Omaha (about 4 million compared to about 600,000). It is also more Democratic (about 90 percent in the District of Columbia voted for Bill Clinton in 1996 compared to 39 percent in the county that includes Omaha) and more African American (27 percent versus 9 percent black). One female minister from Washington noted during her interview that there are so many women in leadership positions in the city that it is not a problem to be a female in a leadership position. Omaha, on the other hand, has an all-male city council and has only had white male mayors. Given the differences in the political climates of Washington and Omaha, one would expect Omaha women to feel more constrained than their colleagues in the Washington area. It is worth noting, however, that the proportion of women clergy (considering the population) is actually larger in Omaha than it is in Washington. Still, Omaha women may feel that the limited number of other women clergy in the area reduces the availability of support networks and visibility for them.

Our analysis is based on comments women made in the interviews that link gender to political choices. We sorted their comments into three categories: issue choices, constraints, and assets. We then looked for patterns within those three categories. *Issue choice* quotations are the women's comments about the political issues that concern them most—and why. *Constraint* quotations are the women's comments about how and why their ability to participate in politics or their political effectiveness is limited by their gender. *Asset* quotations are those that explain how gender can serve as an asset for political activity.

These three categories of comments fit rather well into two overarching themes: (1) responses that emphasize gender experiences *in general* and (2) responses that emphasize gender experiences *in the clergy profession.* Responses that fit into the first category address the effects of women's experiences on their political choices: for example, "I care about education because I am a mom" or "Women have difficulty getting respect because of their collabora-

tive leadership style." One might expect to hear similar comments from other women regardless of their profession. Responses in the second category are specific to the experience of serving in a male-dominated profession, such as "I care about discrimination because I have experienced it" or "Because there are so few women clergy, I get invited to participate in more activities."

Issue Choices

The comments on women's choice of issues about which they are concerned come from responses to a set of two questions. First we asked the women clergy what issues concern them most. Then we asked them if any of those issues concerned them *more* because of their gender. Seventy-two percent of the women responded that at least one of the issues caused them greater concern because of their gender.

Gender Matters

Five of the Washington women argued that their gender had an effect on which specific issues concerned them most. For these women, particular political issues have added salience because of their life experiences as women. One woman noted that "as a mom, I am especially concerned about school and education issues" (personal interview 109, 18 March 1998). Another said, "Living as a woman in this day and age, I can't help but be aware of the issues that seem to affect women across the board. Issues of poverty, issues of safety, issues of just basic concern for reproductive choice . . . absolutely gender plays a role" (personal interview 113, 4 May 1998).

Other women picked up on this theme by making comments about political issues tied to specific concerns about women's bodies. Two Washington women ranked issues of reproductive choice high on their political agendas. Another woman identified breast cancer as an issue that concerns her more because of her gender—and interestingly also her ethnicity: "it affects women, but also . . . some Jewish women are most susceptible to getting breast cancer" (personal interview 107, 6 May 1998).

The Omaha women who tied gender to their issue choices sounded much like the Washington-area women. As in Washington, Omaha clergy discussed children's issues and reproductive choice. Four women tied their concerns about issues of reproductive rights to their gender. One woman expressed her

frustration over the abortion issue: "When you talk about reproductive rights, you're talking about an issue where the so-called anti-choice folk refuse to believe that women have the competence to make those decisions for themselves" (personal interview 011, 22 April 1998). Others discussed the added salience of children's issues and poverty. One woman stated that she cared more about poverty issues because of her gender "because I have seen so many women put in circumstances that they have to suffer. There is still inequity in pay, as well as advancement in jobs" (personal interview 001, 1 April 1998). Another woman added, "When you talk about welfare reform, you are talking about women, primarily, and children" (personal interview 011, 22 April 1998). One minister indicated that domestic violence was of more concern to her because of her gender.

Status Matters

Experiences with the status of women in the clergy profession foster concerns about issues related to discrimination among the Washington women. Four of them stated that their experiences of exclusion within the profession have led them to pay greater attention to issues of discrimination and the need for greater inclusiveness. As one woman explained, "I think the racism issue and . . . [homosexuality] affect me more because I am part of a gender that for a long time was excluded and is particularly excluded from the ordained leadership in the church" (personal interview 112, 1 April 1998). Two women specifically addressed the need to redress discrimination against homosexuals, while two other women argued that their status in the profession has given them a greater awareness of the need to challenge the status quo, particularly concerning issues of equality. As one woman explained, "Women have a special responsibility to articulate their politics in particular ways because we stand on the shoulders [of those] who stood before us. When it comes to issues of equality, then perhaps women clergy do have a particular need to get involved" (personal interview 113, 4 May 1998). Another explained that she was breaking gender barriers in her denomination and claimed that "because of who I am, I am reminded that I cannot be just part of the status quo" (personal interview 109, 1 April 98).

Three of the Omaha women, all United Methodist ministers, discussed how their experiences with exclusion or prejudice have created a deeper concern within them about political issues concerning discrimination. All three

women discussed their concerns about discrimination based on economic status, race, and sexual orientation. Only one of them, however, related her comments more to gender experiences in general than to the specific experiences in the clergy profession: "I just assume that if you're a woman, you have to always be on the side of the oppressed" (personal interview 015, 10 June 1998). The other two women made their comments in the context of discussion concerning experiences in the clergy profession. One woman noted that "as a woman, I have been aware of gender issues in a way that I had not ever realized, and because of the things that I have experienced at times. I hope that has made me more sensitive to how other people are treated, including by me, because of the nature of the structures that we live in" (personal interview 002, 9 June 1998). The third United Methodist discussed her frustration with the prejudice that she has faced and argued that it has opened her eyes to ongoing problems with discrimination. "When I discovered that . . . the United Methodist Church has been ordaining women since 1956, I expected that the church would be relatively friendly to women, but my first appointment was very much troubled by issues of them not wanting a woman pastor" (personal interview 008, 13 April 1998).

Although the Omaha women serving in other denominations discussed challenges that they faced due to discrimination in their profession, only the United Methodists discussed how this challenge—and their gender—affected the issues that they considered most important. The United Methodist women may have been more sensitive to issues of discrimination during the time of the interviews since they occurred in the midst of a controversy over a homosexual union ceremony performed by a male United Methodist minister, Rev. Jimmy Creech, in Omaha (see McCord 1997). This context could have made political issues of discrimination and the vulnerability of a minister's position even more politically relevant to them. United Methodist women clergy may also be more likely to experience additional challenges because there are more conservative ministers in the United Methodist Church who might challenge women than would be the case in other mainline Protestant traditions (Guth et al. 1994, 1997).

Gender Does Not Matter

Two women in Washington and one in Omaha who emphasized inclusiveness issues explained that these issues do *not* concern them more because of

their gender. Two of these women argued that gender did not matter because their husbands share their political concerns. As one woman noted, "My husband is much more liberal than I am, and when I am tempted to take a more moderate view, he pushes me to be more liberal. He is very big on women's equality issues" (personal interview 009, 15 April 1998). One of these women later backed off a bit to say that her experience as a mother may have affected her views: "I think my husband would answer the same thing and would have the same sorts of concerns. So no, [gender does] not necessarily [matter]. Maybe being a mother has affected my views" (personal interview 106, 24 March 1998). The third woman's family background had a bigger effect on her political views and actions than her experiences as a woman or as a minister: "It was my upbringing more. . . . I grew up in a political family" (personal interview 102, 27 April 1998).

Analysis

Table 4.1 summarizes the women's responses about how gender influences their choices about the issues that concern them most. The responses from the two cities concerning issue choice are very similar, so the table reflects the experiences of women from both cities well. The women's comments about their gender's effect on their issue choice focused on reasons why particular issues are more relevant for women. These issues appear to be more salient either

TABLE 4.1. *Summary of Women Clergy's Comments on Issue Choices*

Type of Comment	Issue Choice
Gender matters	Issues concerning women's bodies
	Reproductive choice
	Breast cancer
	Issues concerning women's experiences
	Welfare
	Children's issues
	Child care
	Domestic violence
	Personal safety
Status matters	Issues concerning discrimination
	Equality
	Homosexual rights
	Challenging the status quo
Gender does not matter	Spouse has similar views
	Family influenced views

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1998 interviews in Omaha and Washington, D.C. $N = 31$.

because they relate specifically to women's bodies or because they resonate more fully with the experiences of women than men. The women's status responses resonate with the argument that the social processes that influence which women enter the ministry and the socialization experiences women clergy undergo in the profession will combine to result in higher levels of support for liberal causes. All of the issue choice responses that are tied to status focus in some way on discrimination and the need to change the structures that perpetuate discrimination.

Women clergy's support for reducing discrimination is probably also bolstered by the norms emphasized by their religious traditions. In these religious traditions, socialization in seminary (see Carroll et al. 1997) and in the profession leads to an awareness of social justice concerns including discrimination. Many male clergy who serve in these traditions also express concerns about such issues (Guth et al. 1997; Olson 2000), as do other women in our sample who do not make gender arguments. But the women quoted in this analysis not only view discrimination issues as important, they see their concern for these issues as related to their gender experiences within their own denominations.

Constraints on Political Choices

The women clergy's comments about constraints on their political choices came primarily from two questions. The first asked whether the minister faced any constraints on her ability to participate in politics. The follow-up question asked if she felt any added constraints because she is a woman. Fifty percent of the women we interviewed said that gender did pose an added constraint. As expected, more of the Omaha women saw their gender as an added constraint (63 percent) than did the Washington women (39 percent). The Omaha women also mentioned constraints in responding to other questions, which yielded even more disparity between the cities. Three times as many Omaha women as Washington women discussed gender-related constraints at some point during the interview. Interestingly, the percentages of women who shared personal stories of discrimination in the two cities were identical (38 percent), yet the emphasis on professional constraints was much higher in Omaha. City context therefore appears to affect the *perception* of gender constraint more than personal experiences with gender discrimination.

Gender Matters

Three of the Washington women made statements about constraints that are related primarily to gender rather than the status of women in the clergy profession. One woman argued that women have more trouble being accepted as gender-neutral spokespersons: "A man, particularly a white man, can stand for all humanity, and a woman can only stand for being a woman. Because of that, when I make a statement or do an action, I am conscious that there are those who might dismiss me or marginalize me because of my gender" (personal interview 103, 4 May 1998). Two other women expressed concerns that female clergy are often dismissed or marginalized because of their collaborative leadership style, or serve as token women who are invited only so that groups and organizations can claim female representation.

Nine Omaha women also discussed constraints that appear more closely related to gender than to the status of women in the profession. Four of the women echoed a concern raised by Washington women that gender stereotypes limit the extent to which they are taken seriously. Two comments in particular mirror the Washington woman's concern about being dismissed because of her collaborative leadership style. As one Omaha woman explained: "Yeah, I think the general attitude is still . . . that perception that it's a strong leadership role and therefore men can probably handle it better. I think it's still an area that women have a long way to go to be accepted as strong leaders, even though I think we've more than proved our abilities" (personal interview 012, 1 April 1998). Two other Omaha women addressed other gender stereotypes. Said one, "I think that first off, if you are active in your community, people think that you are strong and people get nervous around strong women. And that right there is a problem that you kind of have to choose how you are going to work with" (personal interview 015, 10 June 1998). A second woman noted that cultural gender norms posed a constraint: "Yes [gender poses an added constraint], but I do not know [that] I am going to verbalize it. [By] people's expectations of clergy women in many ways, we are expected to be polite, and political activity is not necessarily seen as polite" (personal interview 003, 29 April 1998).

The rest of the Omaha women raised concerns that do not overlap with those expressed by the Washington women. Four discussed the difficulty of

balancing family and work: the "second shift" problem (Hochschild 1989). They claimed that women still bear much of the burden of family responsibilities, which creates an added constraint for women clergy. One woman explained the juggling act as follows: "Yes, in one way [spouse and children] have decreased probably what I do because I am aware that they need to see me. I kind of always feel that tension, what it takes to be a good mom and what it takes to be a good [minister]. On the other hand, I am very aware of what kind of world that I want my son to grow up in, and therefore I do feel that it is important that I speak out on certain issues" (personal interview 006, 24 April 1998). It is noteworthy that only one Washington woman discussed the second shift problem: "I've got a twelve- and thirteen-year-old. So I try to choose things that can overlap with my mothering responsibilities" (personal interview 109, 18 March 1998). The second shift problem can hit single mothers even harder: "As a single parent, time is a large constraint, and [ministry] itself is very demanding as far as hours and emotionally" (personal interview 012, 1 April 1998). One Omaha woman added that her gender serves as an added constraint because of threats to her personal safety in the inner-city neighborhood in which she works.

Status Matters

In discussing the status of women in the ministry, the Washington women made it clear that they felt that female clergy are evaluated more critically than are male clergy. This added pressure either puts their political activity under greater scrutiny or creates a situation that leaves them less time for political action. Two women claimed that people pay more attention to every statement that women ministers and rabbis make, which forces them to exercise additional caution. One woman explained that women clergy tend to be "stretched thin," because it is symbolically important for a woman minister to attend church and community functions as frequently as possible. This leaves them even less little time for political activity. Another woman said that the added scrutiny placed on women creates a further time constraint: "It is still true that women have to do a better job than men do. So women tend to spend more time with church activities and might not have as much time to participate in politics" (personal interview 112, 1 April 1998). One young minister first said that her age, not her gender, was her primary constraint. But in the

end she allowed that her gender might also work against her: "Maybe if I was thirty years old and a male, I don't think I would have as many problems" (personal interview 102, 27 April 1998).

Six Omaha women, most of whom are United Methodists, also identified constraints that relate to the problem of added scrutiny. Once again, we find United Methodist women standing out in their concern about professional discrimination in Omaha. The Omaha clergy also raised concerns about challenges to the authority of women clergy. Some of the women tied these two concerns together in a way that makes it difficult to sort them into categories of added scrutiny and challenges to authority. For example, one Omaha woman stated, "You have to go a step further in order to have people take you seriously. . . . Women clergy are looked at as peculiar, and often they spend more time sizing you up rather than listening to you, so you have to overcome this by strategizing" (personal interview 001, 1 April 1998).

One newly appointed minister explained that she limits her political activities because she is still in the process of being accepted by her congregation. She noted that the issue of acceptance has been especially difficult for her because her congregation has called very few women clergy: "There has only been one other woman. And bless her heart; she just wasn't too well received. So, I have some self-imposed restrictions because of her. You know, I am really careful, I don't rock the boat too much" (personal interview 007, 10 June 1998).

Three Omaha clergy were concerned about the consequences of being labeled "too liberal." One claimed "we get labeled quicker than any males do" (personal interview 014, 8 June 1998). Similarly, another said that she is always aware of the unspoken fear on the part of her congregation that she is going to be one of "those feminists." A third woman recalled that she was initially afraid of losing her job over being labeled a liberal and a feminist, but that those fears were not realized: "I expected that after a year that they would kick me out of here [because] 'she's a liberal, she's a feminist,' but nothing happened" (personal interview 015, 10 June 1998).

Two of the Omaha women explicitly shared the fact that fear of losing their jobs constrained their political activity. One stated, "I wish I could do more, but I don't think in reality, if we want to keep our jobs, we can" (personal interview 014, 8 June 1998). The other woman was quite concerned about the confidentiality of the interview and stressed that she felt she could lose her job due to her political views.

Three women's responses fall more squarely into the theme of challenges to authority. One minister explained how difficult it is to have her authority challenged constantly: "In my first position, everything I said was questioned, and this was very exhausting because it made me doubt what I knew, what my beliefs were, and whether I was able to lead" (personal interview 008, 13 April 1998). Another woman explained, "You have a whole authority issue if you are a clergy woman that you have to constantly fight to be taken seriously. It is annoying, but it is not like we are surprised by it" (personal interview 015, 10 June 1998). These women are concerned that challenges to their authority limit the effectiveness of what they do. As one said, "I think that I am free to say what I want. However, there is some question in my mind about whether it is seen with the same authority as a male" (personal interview 006, 24 April 1998).

Gender Does Not Matter

One woman in Washington argued that she is not constrained by any specific situations in her congregation: "My situation is unique. My [senior] pastor is very open to women in ministry. . . . He'll let me do anything that I like" (personal interview 114, 5 May 1998). A female associate minister in Omaha explained that the "grandfatherly" demeanor of her church's senior pastor—and the congregation's deference to him—allows her more freedom concerning politics than she would otherwise experience. She did lament, however, that her congregation may be granting her leeway because they assume that she is powerless. The theme conveyed by both of these women is that gender is not a personal constraint for them because of the nature of their current congregational positions.

Analysis

The themes that women clergy raised in their discussions of constraints are summarized and categorized in table 4.2. The responses are more reflective of the experiences of the Omaha women because they had much more to say about constraints than did the women in Washington. The fact that the Omaha women were more likely to express the view that gender is a constraint is consistent with our expectation that the political climate in Omaha would cause its women clergy to feel more constrained in their political choices than would be the case in Washington. Women clergy who argued that gender places an added constraint on their political activity claimed that their gender

TABLE 4.2. *Summary of Women Clergy's Comments on Constraints*

Type of Comment	Constraint
Gender matters	Women clergy are marginalized
	Cannot be gender neutral
	Are dismissed due to gender
	Are dismissed due to leadership style
	Discomfort of others with strong women
	Second shift problem
Status matters	Women clergy receive additional scrutiny
	Must be cautious about political statements
	Require more time:
	To do ministry tasks
	To be present at events
	Fear labeling
	Fear losing job
	Women clergy's authority is challenged
	Are "sized up" more than heard
	Statements have less impact
Gender does not matter	Current position is safe

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1998 interviews in Omaha and Washington, D.C. $N = 31$.

burdens them with family responsibilities and allows others to dismiss them. Further, they felt that the status of women in the profession sets some female clergy up to be scrutinized and labeled and to have their authority challenged when they speak on political issues.

Other women clergy, however, indicated that gender does *not* constrain their political choices. This discrepancy shows that while there are several constraints that women clergy *may* face as a professional minority, individual women clergy encounter a wide variety of experiences in specific congregations. Some feel constrained in their positions, and others do not. To wit: half of the women claimed either that they *personally* do not face significant challenges in their present position or that they do not face them to the same extent as other women clergy.

These responses resonate with previous research on women clergy (Carroll, Hargrove, and Lummis 1983; Lehman 1985) indicating that while congregation members may fear women ministers in the abstract, they will accept a specific woman minister who does well in their congregation and whom they come to know personally. The threats that women clergy face appear to be widely *recognized* but not as widely *personalized,* because many women feel accepted or safe in their current position. Consequently, the political constraints that may accompany the status of women in the profession may not

affect women's political choices as directly as we might expect. In fact, it is far too simplistic to assume that women clergy are all constrained politically because of their minority status in the profession.

Assets and Political Choices

When asked if their gender served as a professional asset, 72 percent of the women interviewed responded in the affirmative. But several of these women focused on the assets that their gender brought to pastoral care more than to political activity. The analysis here focuses on the responses that discuss gender-related assets in terms of political activity.

Gender Matters

Although some of the women argued that the collaborative leadership style adopted by many women could result in their being dismissed politically, one Washington-area minister asserted that the collaborative style is a political asset for women clergy because it allows them to bring more people into political activities. Two other Washington women argued that their gender is an asset because it lends them credibility on particular issues or with certain groups of people. One woman claimed that her gender adds credibility to her work on abortion: "Being somewhat of an activist in the pro-choice causes, being a woman was an asset" (personal interview 104, 29 April 1998). Another believed that her life experiences as a middle-aged woman lend her credibility with other women: "I have some credibility with women, especially in that I've been there and I've known that. . . . I've had some down-in-the-ditches experiences, and I've just lived through [them]" (personal interview 106, 24 March 1998).

Three of the Washington women raised the interesting theme that their gender serves as an asset for political dialogue because it makes them appear less threatening. These women claimed that in fact they were able to be *more controversial* because of their gender. As one minister explained, "I can bring some issues forward and not be as threatening, because people see me as nonthreatening. So I think I actually raise some difficult questions and get people to think about certain issues in a comfortable way. I can use people's image that I'm soft and gentle and nonthreatening" (personal interview 103, 17 March 1998). Another minister argued that her gender, combined with her physical

appearance and southern accent, work to her benefit: "Because my appearance is generally nonthreatening, people find themselves listening, generally, before they realize [what] it is that I am saying. I learned that if I am careful with that, I can drive a point home before people realize [it]. [I can] start talking about things that are very controversial, very touchy, and if someone [else], particularly an African American male, [would] strike up the same conversation, people would tune out immediately" (personal interview 101, 22 April 1998).

None of the Omaha women said anything about women having a nonthreatening appearance. But two of the Omaha women did mirror comments of Washington women about their added credibility on particular issues. As one observed, "Sure, [gender is an asset] in terms of credibility on certain issues, such as abortion . . . and in speaking from the pulpit on domestic violence" (personal interview 009, 15 April 1998). Another minister echoed that her gender was an advantage in dealing with domestic violence issues: "As a female [minister], I was able to say that what the male clergy were espousing was not biblically correct" (personal interview 012, 1 April 1998). Three clergy in Omaha claimed that being a woman is an asset because it lends them a different perspective in policy discussions: " I think that our different perspective is important and needs to be considered along with other perspectives" (personal interview 002, 9 June 1998). Another woman added, "I think that [my gender] is an asset in terms of seeing the feminine perspective. . . . When we are dealing with social issues and political issues, we are dealing with the human race [which includes women]" (personal interview 007, 10 June 1998).

Status Matters

Two Washington women said that gender is an asset for issues related to the minority professional status of women clergy. Both argued that they are *more* likely to be asked to participate in policy activities because a group wants a female representative—and there are relatively few other women clergy available. Said one, "I still, whenever I wear my collar, get stares. . . . I think that people often turn to me, whether to come to me for counseling or to invite me to come and speak at a rally or come walk with them behind a banner, because I am a woman clergy" (personal interview 113, 4 May 1998). One rabbi also argued that the scarcity of women clergy in the community means that women clergy receive more attention, which can be a political asset:

"There are fewer women clergy around, so we are pretty well known in the community . . . so there are still people paying more attention . . . . It's a constraint, because you want to be careful, but on the other hand, you have more potential for an impact" (personal interview 110, 30 March 1998). None of the Omaha women, though, said they see their status in the profession as an asset.

Analysis

Table 4.3 summarizes the women clergy's comments about their gender and status as assets for political activity. The first two themes in the gender category focus on specific things that women can bring to the table (such as credibility or a different perspective). The second two themes highlight stylistic advantages that women enjoy in political activity (such as collaborative approaches to leadership or a nonthreatening style). The themes in the category of the status of women clergy highlight the advantages of the minority position of women in the ministry. The status responses reflect only the experiences of the Washington-area women.

One associate minister's speculation that she might have more leeway in political choices because her congregation may see her as powerless shows that serving as an *associate* minister could be an asset for political activity. None of the other associate ministers discussed their positions in quite the same way. But it is possible that when a congregation focuses most of its attention on the senior minister, female associate clergy may have the leeway to engage in political activity that would not be seen as acceptable if a senior female minister pursued it.

TABLE 4.3. *Summary of Women Clergy's Comments on Assets*

Type of Comment	Asset
Gender matters	Women clergy have credibility on:
	Reproductive choice
	Domestic violence
	Women
	Have different perspective
	Have collaborative leadership style
	Are nonthreatening
Status matters	Are more likely to be recruited
	Receive more attention
	Have understanding of discrimination

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1998 interviews in Omaha and Washington, D.C. $N = 31$.

This chapter shows that gender matters, at least for a majority of women clergy. Gender affects women clergy's political choices because they have professional experiences that differ greatly from those of men. It also matters because being a woman minister means being in a minority, and at times contested, position in many religious institutions. Such experiences bear upon the sorts of issues that matter most to these women, as well as the constraints and assets that they bring to political activism.

There is good reason to believe that women clergy may be ripe for political mobilization. As Ted Jelen notes in chapter 2, the mainline religious traditions in which these women serve traditionally have provided their clergy with a "straightforward rationale" for participating in politics through their emphasis on social justice. Moreover, feminist socialization provides an additional rationale for many women clergy to engage in political action. Likewise, their socialization experience as a professional minority gives them a unique vantage point from which to view issues of discrimination. The passion and conviction with which these women view such issues make them a valuable resource for political groups that champion such progressive causes.

Several women clergy argue that their gender serves as an asset for political activity on issues that relate to women because they have added credibility on those issues. But these women also face very real costs if they choose to become involved in politics or to attempt to mobilize others, particularly in more conservative regions. Concerns about being labeled or marginalized or losing a job may make some women cautious about undertaking visible participation on controversial issues unless they feel that they are in a safe congregational position.

Our analysis here does not speak to whether these women actually *participate* in political activities that address issues of equality and inclusion, only that they consider these issues to be of great concern to them. But elsewhere (Olson et al. 1998) we report evidence of political activity on discrimination issues by about one-third of these women. Some women feel safe in their positions, which allow them to participate more openly in politics. Others get involved in controversial issues in ways that make it unlikely that their congregation will notice. Concerns about constraints, then, do not necessarily prevent women from being mobilized. The comments of a few women suggest that associate ministers may be in the best position to act on controversial issues, which means that mobilization efforts that use address lists with

only the names of senior pastors may be missing a large pool of potential women clergy recruits.

The emphasis that these women place on issues of discrimination and abortion also appears to support the speculation that the influx of women into the ministry will exacerbate tensions between liberal and conservative religious camps by moving the liberal camp further to the left (Hunter and Sargeant 1993). But jumping immediately to this conclusion ignores the ways that women clergy's experiences may change as more women enter the ministry. As women clergy become more numerous and more accepted, feminist paradigms may become less relevant and therefore less likely to shape women clergy's political attitudes. This may lessen the differences between male and female clergy. It is important also to acknowledge the challenges that have been brought against the "culture wars" thesis (DiMaggio, Evans, and Bryson 1996; Williams 1997), which make the question of whether the "culture wars" would be exacerbated by the "feminization" of the clergy moot. In any case, we agree with Guth (chapter 3) that it is important to continue to study the experiences and contributions of women to the American ministry.

5 Theocratic, Prophetic, and Ecumenical: Political Roles of African American Clergy

MARY R. SAWYER

In his now classic collection of essays, *The Souls of Black Folk,* W. E. B. Du Bois observed: "The 'preacher' is the most unique personality developed by the Negro on American soil. A leader, a politician, an orator, a 'boss,' an intriguer, an idealist—all these he is" (1903/1969, 211). Were he writing from the perspective of the end of the twentieth century, rather than its beginning, Du Bois would be obliged to add to his litany: a business manager, a general contractor, a community organizer, a scholar—"all these he *and she* are." Whatever changes were wrought by the twentieth century, "leader" and "politician" remain two of the primary roles of African American clergy. Accordingly, until very recently, and to a significant degree still today, no figures in black communities are more influential in shaping the political mindset of African American church members than clergy.

That this is so is a corollary to the continuing social status of African Americans as a marginalized minority group in American society. Some things have not changed since the black church[1] was born out of sociological and theological protest against the racial discrimination that African Americans experienced in predominantly European American churches in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In both the independent church movement of free black people in the North and the evolution of the "invisible institution" (covert religious practice) among slaves in the South, the preacher emerged as not only the moral and spiritual leader of the people but their political leader as well. Being a black religious leader in this era meant protesting slavery, either as a participant in the clergy-dominated Negro Convention Movement that emerged during the antebellum period, or as an organizer of any of the hundreds of slave revolts that were inspired by biblical imagery. Religious leadership also meant giving solace and providing assurance of a better day to come—and in the process giving substance to the hope that made continued living bearable.

The political roles African American clergy have played in the nearly seven score years since emancipation have varied according to the national mood and the moment's need. Accordingly, this chapter emphasizes the significance of historical context and the specific social circumstances of respective historical periods as primary determinants in the political choices made by African American clergy and their constituents. The very fact of *being* African American in a society where white power and privilege dominate is of course itself the first contextual consideration. Corollary to this consideration is the existence of a distinct African American religious orientation that combines elements of traditional African cosmology, evangelical Christianity, and the all-pervasive experience of oppression. The resultant redaction is a black religious tradition that holds as its ultimate values communalism, the welfare of the collectivity, the integral relation of the spiritual and the material, and the moral obligation to pursue social-political concretization of the theological principles of equality, justice, and inclusiveness.

This is not to say that black religious expressions are monolithic; on the contrary, black religion manifests a tremendous diversity. But while black clergy have chosen different political strategies and activities in different historical periods and, indeed, within different black religious expressions, the bedrock for choosing to be politically engaged in the first place remains constant.

During the periods of the black sojourn in America when black clergy devoted their energies most urgently and intently to the tasks of sanctuary and survival (the decades of Jim Crow segregation), they created a theocratic relationship with their collective congregation: the black population of the United States. The notion of church-state separation is a far less relevant concern in the African American community than it is for other racial and ethnic groups in the United States. Religion informs black politics, and politics informs black religion.

In turning to the task of pursuing justice by transforming the entire nation, African American clergy have assumed a prophetic posture, sometimes performing solo and at other times acting in concert (see Day chapter 6). The latter mode was exemplified in the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, which is appropriately characterized as a movement of and by the black church (Morris 1984). In the years following this movement, African American clergy reclaimed and expanded an older form of political activity—elec-

toral politics. Concurrently, a new form of political activity emerged in the form of ecumenical (cooperative) interdenominational activism. It is the task of this chapter to examine in turn each of these expressions of the politics of African American Christian clergy: the theocratic, the prophetic, the electoral, and the ecumenical.

Politics in the Theocratic Mode

The African American community has often been characterized as a "nation within a nation." In part this characterization is based on the extreme degree of separation from the institutions of mainstream America that was long imposed on black residents. More aptly, the "nation within a nation" metaphor refers to the reality of the social cohesiveness and ethnic identity that developed among African Americans as a consequence of that separation. These senses of nationhood and identity are inextricable from the black church.

The black church enjoyed phenomenal growth in the years immediately following emancipation, when the religious "invisible institution" of former slaves merged with the churches of free blacks. Even more important than the growth of black churches, argues E. Franklin Frazier (1964), was the role churches played in structuring and organizing all of black life. "An organized religious life," he writes, "became the chief means by which a structured or organized social life came into existence among the . . . masses." It was through the black church that a black *society* came into being (Frazier 1964, 36). The church, he points out, functioned as the agency of social control, an initiator of economic institutions, the founder of educational institutions, and the primary arena for honing political skills. "Moreover," writes Frazier, "since the Negro was an outsider in the American community, it was the church that enlisted his [*sic*] deepest loyalties. For the Negro masses, in their social and moral isolation in American society, the Negro church community has been a nation within a nation" (1964, 49).

Significantly, even Marxist historian Eugene Genovese (1974) recognizes the role that organized religion played in fostering a national consciousness and identity for a vast assortment of African American people who had lost their original tribal identities. Genovese argues that the folk religion of the slaves both contributed to the building of an "American" Christianity and

"laid the foundation for a 'Black' Christianity of their own. That is, it made possible a universal statement because it made possible a national statement. . . . For blacks, the national statement expressed a duality as something both black and American, not in the mechanical sense of being an ethnic component in a pluralistic society, but in the dialectical sense of simultaneously being itself and the other, both separately and together, and of developing as a religion within a religion in a nation within a nation" (Genovese 1974, 280–81).

Wilson Moses also highlights the duality and religious underpinnings of this identity. "There is," he says, "a difference between citizenship and nationality, and although Afro-Americans are, for the most part, loyal citizens of the United States of America, they tend to perceive themselves, and be perceived by others, as a permanently distinct people in the land of their birth—in other words, as a 'nation within a nation'" (1990, 34–35). Moses observes that African Americans think of themselves as part of the "American people" *and* as disassociated from the "American people." And black nationalism is more than just a reaction to African Americans' feelings of rejection. "It also arises from a shared racial mythology and a shared sense of historical mission and destiny. The mystical, teleological element of American Black nationalism has usually been related to religious tradition. In the nineteenth century, Black nationalism was almost inseparable from religion" (Moses 1990, 35).

In an earlier work, Moses (1982) points out the influence of the "messianic American civil religion" on black nationalism, by which he means the theology and imagery of Puritanism that diffused throughout nineteenth-century American culture. The United States took on a self-understanding that it had a covenant with God to carry out a divine mission. A people held in bondage could easily appropriate this message—and they did (Moses 1982, 29–31). To enslaved Africans, America itself was more akin to Egypt than the Promised Land, so it was all the more to be expected that God and God's agents would lead them into freedom. And indeed, that was precisely the responsibility assumed by black church leaders, who were known to the "folk" as "preacher."

In this "holy commonwealth" created for African Americans by the special conjoining of nation and church, black clergy took on a wide variety of political responsibilities both inside and outside of the African American community. During the brief years of Reconstruction, hundreds of black ministers became involved in electoral politics and served in public offices from local

school boards to the U.S. Congress. Electoral politics aside, Manning Marable argues that during and immediately following Reconstruction, "almost every black minister was something of a politician, and every aspiring black politician had to be something of a minister" (1983, 197).

One Reconstruction officeholder, Rev. James Pendleton, attests to the earnestness with which minister-politicians came to their mission:

> Nor can a preacher more than any other citizen plead his religious work or the sacredness of that work as an exemption from duty. Going to the Bible to learn the relation of pulpit to politics and accepting the prophets, Christ, and Apostles, and the pulpit of their times and their precepts and examples as the guide of the pulpit today, I think that their conclusion will be that wherever there is sin to be rebuked, no matter by whom committed, and ill to be averted or good to be achieved by our country or mankind [*sic*], there is a place for the pulpit to make itself felt and heard. The truth is, all the help the preachers and all other good and worthy citizens can give by taking hold of politics is needed in order to keep the government out of bad hands and secure the ends for which governments are formed (quoted in Fleming 1968, 18).

As the system of Jim Crow segregation was instituted and southern blacks were systematically disenfranchised, electoral options were severely diminished. One might expect that the preacher's political role was also extinguished, but the reality was quite to the contrary. In fact, as Marable points out, "one of the few remaining roles in which articulate and militant young Black men could exercise political influence was as a preacher" (1983, 197).

If freedom was the unswerving objective of the black theocracy, survival was its prerequisite. As the South extended its reign of terror against African Americans, segregation between the races approached the parameters of slavery. Meanwhile black clergy emerged as the primary link between black communities and the power structure of the larger community. Black ministers, doctors, and teachers were typically the only African Americans able to command any respect at all from white leaders, and often "respect" was merely a veneer of political expediency. If incidents occurred that sparked tension between blacks and whites, it was the minister who diffused the situation. If services were to be obtained for black residents, it was the minister who negotiated them. Ever walking a tight rope between advocacy and moderator, the black minister of the South fulfilled his "civic" obligations as well as he was

able given the serious restrictions imposed by southern codes of conduct and lack of financial resources.

When city hall, the sheriff's office, or the local school board did not require his attention, black ministers had to attend to numerous pastoral responsibilities. In the midst of a hostile and dangerous environment, it fell to the minister to create a self-contained world in which the talents of his flock could be expressed—and their self-worth affirmed. As C. Eric Lincoln has put it, the church functionally became the members' school, forum, political arena, social club, art gallery, and conservatory of music. "It was," he writes, "lyceum and gymnasium as well as *sanctum sanctorum*" (Lincoln 1972, ix–x).

In the church, which was the sole institution fully controlled by the Black community, members could develop skills, laugh and weep, worship, parent, plan, and dream as the storms raged outside in a fury that precluded exercising even basic citizenship rights. Church members were socialized to be properly deferential to the preacher, so his word was rarely disputed. Together with the church deacons, the preacher ruled in an autocratic fashion, setting the parameters for conduct not only within the church family but within personal families as well. Typically he was rewarded with love, respect, and the material signs of success that enabled his faithful (but often impoverished) church members vicariously to enjoy the standing the minister enjoyed in the community at large.

Many of these functions of black churches were transplanted to the North during the years of the so-called great migration, which took place between the late 1800s and World War II. During this era, however, the diversity within the black church became much more evident. The multitude of small Pentecostal storefront churches that appeared continued to provide a sense of community and identity for the new urban lower class, but these churches were decidedly apolitical. In contrast, the clergy of some large urban middle-class churches became engaged in a form of political activity that Martin Kilson (1971) has termed "clientage politics." In this model, black leaders—ministers, doctors, and teachers in particular—would receive political and civic appointments in exchange for delivering support to the white power structure. Such an arrangement, according to Kilson, "permitted the [black] client leadership to control or at least influence some part of the political process that allocated services to the [black] urban subsystem, especially welfare and settlement services" (1971, 172).

Other middle-class churches that were part of the black denominational mainstream attended primarily to the needs of their bourgeois constituents. Often those needs were as much social as spiritual. There was a notable turn in some of these churches toward emulating white worship styles and being sedate in public presentations in order to achieve greater acceptability in the eyes of the white community. Significant portions of the black community rejected these churches and turned to alternative expressions of religion. Among these were the more nationalistic movements that rejected Christianity altogether in favor of separatist quasi-Islamic or quasi-Jewish movements such as the Nation of Islam. Some were attracted, too, to esoteric spiritual groups or to Marcus Garvey's "back to Africa" religiopolitical movement.

Not all of the radicalism, however, was coming from outside the black mainline churches. The clergy from larger, wealthier churches who crossed class lines to attend to the less educated and less skilled were relatively few in number—but were nonetheless a significant presence. Rev. J. C. Austin, pastor of Pilgrim Baptist Church in Chicago from 1926 to 1950, was exemplary of those whose ministries reflected a concern for the social welfare of the larger community. Austin manifested his concern by organizing a chapter of the NAACP and conducting black voter registration drives in his church that supported Chicago's black political machine and helped elect Oscar DePriest as the first African American in Congress since Reconstruction. Austin also participated in the organization of the Citizens Committee, which was instrumental in creating the first black trade union, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (Burkett 1997).

Another example of devotion to racial uplift was the work of a bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, Reverdy C. Ransom. In the mid-1930s, Bishop Ransom organized the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, a national organization that included representatives of nearly all black denominations and sects. The Fraternal Council's most significant action, beyond being a prophetic voice of the black church for the behalf of all black citizens, was its creation of a Washington bureau in the 1940s. For nearly twenty years the Washington bureau functioned as an official lobby for the passage of national antidiscrimination and equal opportunity legislation (Sawyer 1994). In important respects, the Fraternal Council anticipated the black ecumenical organizations that would emerge in the 1960s and 1970s.

Even as circumstances compelled the church to turn inward, clergy repre-

sentatives of the black nation acted as foreign emissaries, struggling to establish productive relations with the United States. In Atlanta, Rev. Martin Luther King, Sr., pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church, was prominent among a group of black clergy who led protests and demonstrations in the mid-1930s in pursuit of voting rights. And in New York City, Rev. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., the pastor of Abyssinian Baptist Church, anticipated the civil rights movement by two decades as he organized economic boycotts in a demand for jobs. The organization he formed, the Greater New York Coordinating Committee, "ultimately became the political instrument which broke the power of New York's Tammany Hall political organization in Harlem." In 1944, Powell was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990, 210–11).

Because they hold dual "citizenship," however, black clergy have always had a commitment that goes beyond representing African American constituents. They have been committed to eliminating the discrepancy between America's creed of equality and its code of conduct in order to create a nobler and more humane society.

Politics in the Prophetic Mode

There are multiple forms and sources of Black religion in the United States. Gayraud Wilmore (1998) offers a formula of African American Christianity that includes the legacy of traditional African religions, the experience of oppression, the development of a black folk religion, and the encounter with white evangelical Christianity during the revivalism of the early nineteenth century. Peter Paris (1995) emphasizes that African Americans have retained the centrality of community from African spirituality. Cornel West (1982) identifies the values of individuality and democracy that black Christians acquired from what he terms "prophetic Christianity."

Arguably, all of these elements have gone into the mix. Traditional African religions, with emphasis on the spiritual nature of all aspects of life—familial, economic, and political—provided an ethos of engagement with the world. The experiential emphasis of evangelical Christianity affirmed (if unwittingly) the theological claim of the parenthood of God and the kinship of all people. This belief became the central tenet of black religious ethics, compelling black Christians to work for the realization of this ideal in the context of American race relations (Paris 1985). Finally, Christianity's prophetic tradi-

tion served to sanction the political activism of the more progressive black ministers. Writes West,

> The basic contribution of prophetic Christianity, despite the countless calamities perpetrated by Christian churches, is that every individual regardless of class, country, caste, race, or sex should have the opportunity to fulfill his or her potentialities. This first and fundamental norm is the core of the prophetic Christian gospel. A transcendent God before whom all persons are equal thus endows the well-being and ultimate salvation of each with equal value and significance. I shall call this radical egalitarian idea *the Christian principle of the self-realization of individuality within community.* This is often interpreted as simply the salvation of *individual* souls in heaven, an otherworldly community. But such a truncated understanding of the core of the Christian gospel accents its otherworldly dimension at the expense of its this-worldly possibilities. The fuller prophetic Christian tradition must thus insist upon both this-worldly liberation and otherworldly salvation as the proper loci of Christianity (1982, 16, emphasis in original).

The key precondition for actualizing the Christian principle of the "self-realization of human individuality in community," then, is "democratic participation of people in the decision-making processes of institutions that regulate and govern their lives. The norms of individuality and democracy," West argues, "are in this way inseparable. The former rests upon the moral code of the Christian gospel, the latter upon its historical realism" (1982, 18–19). Elaborating on the dimension of "this-worldly liberation," West writes,

> For prophetic Christianity, the two inseparable notions of freedom are existential freedom and social freedom. Existential freedom is an effect of the divine gift of grace which promises to sustain persons through and finally deliver them from the bondage to death, disease, and despair. Social freedom is the aim of Christian political practice, a praxis that flows from the divine gift of grace; social freedom results from the promotion and actualization of the norms of individuality and democracy. Existential freedom empowers people to fight for social freedom, to realize its political dimension. Existential freedom anticipates history and is ultimately trans-historical, whereas social freedom is thoroughly a matter of this-worldly human liberation (1982, 18).

Much of the political activism that African American clergy have undertaken has been in this mode of prophetic Christianity, whether the specific method

has been moral persuasion, nonviolent civil disobedience, or electoral politics.

Moral Persuasion

Moral persuasion is perhaps the simplest form of prophetic activity, and in fact it appropriates the style of preaching that was common to the prophets of the Hebrew Bible. New England Puritans exercised the *jeremiad* (as it is called in honor of the biblical prophet Jeremiah) whenever they thought there had been a violation of their covenant with God. The jeremiad subsequently became a familiar rhetorical expression in America's public religious tradition. In its generic form, the jeremiad contains several elements: an analysis of a crisis situation, a reminder of the covenant with God, an assessment that some have failed to keep the covenant, a call to repentance and renewed obedience, and a prediction of the consequences that would result should the people fail to restore the covenantal relationship (Wentz 1990, 197–98).

In the pulpits of messianic black clergy, jeremiads took on a specific focus, namely America's failure to fulfill its "covenantal duty to deal justly with Blacks" (Moses 1982, 30). Thus Wilson Moses uses the term *jeremiad* "to describe the constant warnings issued by blacks to whites, concerning the judgment that was to come for the sin of slavery" (1982, 30–31). Black leaders invoked the jeremiad in its pure form to "boldly and unrelentingly lambaste white Americans for violating the national ideals and covenant by their racism" (Howard-Pitney 1990, 15).

In twentieth-century America, the sin at issue was not slavery but segregation, and the jeremiad became a familiar aspect of the Black church movement that set out to undo the sin. Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the most famous of the prophetic civil rights preachers, but he was joined by countless other black ministers—most of them Baptist, some Methodist, a few Pentecostal—in urging America to strive for consistency of ideals and practices.

Protest Politics

The moral analyses of Dr. King and his colleagues led to organization and activism, most notably through the instrumentality of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and its local alliances. From the time of the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955 until Dr. King's assassination in 1968, African American clergy held rallies in black churches, recruited marchers from

church ranks, used their churches as a communications network, and raised funds from those in the pews, all the while inspiring the people with their social justice preaching.

In the year when Dr. King was assassinated, the civil rights movement turned to a kind of political involvement that was quite different from the historic political activity of black ministers. Referring to the Montgomery ministers, Fleming (1968) points out that black clergy were not serving any one political party, as parties were not relevant to their boycott. Instead they were working for the interests of the ordinary people who were marching. They were obligated only to their people and their God. For these clergy, politics took on a larger dimension than just partisan activity.

Fleming lists several examples of the political involvement of hundreds of African American ministers throughout the South. They were involved in challenging discriminatory voter registration practices, fighting the racial gerrymandering that precluded the election of Black representation, and desegregating schools and public accommodations. Through boycotts, they compelled businesses to employ blacks, opened up opportunities in public service, and waged the battle for passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act (Fleming 1968).

With the passage of these two landmark pieces of legislation, the civil rights movement had achieved, at least under law, its two primary goals: the elimination of Jim Crow segregation and the enfranchisement of southern blacks. With the death of Dr. King, the protest phase of the movement came to a close. But many African Americans came to see black political development as the second stage of the civil rights movement. Accordingly, they turned their attention to electing black officeholders who would be able to shape public policy and work for equitable allocation of public resources.

Electoral Politics

In the decade following passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, the number of black elected officials in the United States increased from less than 300 to some 3,500. Many of those who ran for public office had been civil rights activists. Some candidates were ministers, and many others were active members of black churches.

Whether or not the minister himself[2] was the candidate, chances are his congregation was engaged in various activities to affect the outcome of elec-

toral campaigns unless he was pastoring a more conservative, evangelical church. This remains true today. In one of the central rituals attending political campaigning in the African American community, it is not uncommon for candidates to be given access to a podium, or even the pulpit, to address the congregation as it is gathered for Sunday worship. While the pastor may not explicitly direct the church members how to vote, his (or her) sentiment and preference are often anything but subtle. As individual citizens, of course, pastors sometimes do publicly endorse a particular candidate by lending their names to campaign brochures or newspaper ads. Often, too, endorsements will be issued through local ministerial alliances or associations.

In an age when electoral campaigns increasingly rely on direct mail and media spots, individual volunteers are indispensable. And congregations are a vital source of envelope stuffers, telephone campaigners, and door-to-door canvassers. Many churches organize transportation systems to deliver voters to the polls. Some churches also use their space to house actual precinct polling booths. Typically, churches work both ends of the campaign, first registering voters and then organizing get-out-the-vote drives.

Striking examples of the importance of local church engagement in politics include the 1984 and 1988 presidential campaigns of Rev. Jesse Jackson and Harold Washington's 1983 campaign to be mayor of Chicago. Washington had run unsuccessfully for mayor in 1977 after the death of Richard J. Daley but was elected in 1981 to the U.S. House of Representatives. When Washington chose to leave the House to run again for mayor, Chicago's black churches rallied around him and fueled voter registration drives that helped him win. Kenneth Wald reports, "One prominent Black minister bluntly told his parishioners that nonregistrants were not welcome in the congregation. A voter registration card was the price of access to the free food distributed by one of the major Baptist churches in the African American community. Under the slogan, 'Praise the Lord and Register,' Black churches committed themselves wholeheartedly to serving as registration centers" (1997, 306–7).

Similarly, black churches provided the very lifeblood for the organization of both of Jesse Jackson's presidential campaigns. Wald characterizes their role and the overall religious ambience of the campaigns in this fashion:

> [Black churches] provided the forum in which his candidacies were first explored and the base for voter registration drives essential to its success. Churches

> also served as the key organizational units of the campaign and generated most of the activists and money to fuel the cause. The religious dimension of Jackson's campaign was most apparent to whites in the candidate's religious language and appeals. Jackson's entire platform rested on a belief in the kinship of humankind through its common link to God; in this view, poverty, racism, and sexism are not merely social problems but sins against the divine spark in all people. He portrayed political action in messianic terms, constantly invoking biblical metaphors and turning an attack on drug use into something resembling a religious crusade (Wald 1997, 307–8).

That African Americans responded to Jackson's candidacy in the manner they did was hardly surprising. In the decade following the end of the civil rights movement, the influence of African American clergy on the population at large was confirmed by a national survey that asked black adults who most influenced their thinking on political matters. The most frequent responses were "the Black church" and "Black ministers" (Walton 1985). In subsequent decades, the black church's influence has diminished as other leadership opportunities for African Americans have become available in government and the private sector, and as the ranks of the black unchurched have grown. The prevailing political ideology of African Americans, however, has not changed. While white Protestants have shifted to the right since the 1970s, black Protestants have remained politically liberal. They also give more support to the Democratic Party and its candidates than any other significant religious grouping in the United States (Wald 1997).

Black ministers have continued to include political action among their roles, and they think of politics in a more general way than just electoral campaigns. In a poll of black clergy conducted in the 1980s, 91.6 percent indicated that they believed churches should express their views on day-to-day social and political questions. These findings were consistent with the results of other surveys conducted over a twenty-year period that pointed to "a broad support and consensus in the Black community, both within and without the churches, among clergy and laity, for a social prophecy role for Black churches" (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990, 226).

The roster of black ministers who have utilized the base of support that Black churches provide to run for political office is extensive. They include

prominent clergy who have served in the U.S. House of Representatives since the civil rights movement, such as Rev. Andrew Young, who also served as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and then as mayor of Atlanta; Rev. Walter Fauntroy and Rev. John Lewis, who were both, like Young, veteran civil rights activists; Rev. William Gray, who rose to the position of majority whip in the House before leaving to head the United Negro College Fund; and most recently Rev. Floyd Flake of New York City.

Black clergy who become involved in politics often view their political work as an extension of their ministry, as evidenced by a remark made to a prospective candidate by a minister-congressman: "Congress will not be difficult," he said. "It is essentially pastoring, ministering to the folks in your district" (Hall 1985). Relative to their colleagues, however, African American members of Congress generally do find such "pastoral" duties demanding because they often represent districts with a disproportionate share of poverty and related problems. But it is this very circumstance that gives African American members of Congress an impetus to play a prophetic role. In the 1970s and 1980s, it was black members of Congress who provided the most aggressive advocacy for affirmative action policies at home and for the interests of Africans and Palestinians abroad. In the 1980s the Congressional Black Caucus prepared an annual "alternative budget" that challenged the values implicit in the supply-side economics embraced by the Reagan administration.

Prophecy, however, has its limits. The black religious community is so invested in traditional democratic processes that most African American clergy remain within the ideological framework of liberal democracy. In turn, most have taken an uncritical stance toward America's capitalist economic system (Smith 1996). While there have been some historic exceptions such as Bishop Reverdy Ransom, Rev. George Washington Woodbey, and to some extent U.S. Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., African American clergy's prophetic activism has been more reformist than radical in both protest and electoral politics.

Although he embraced the reform mode of activism in the early years of the civil rights movement, Martin Luther King became more critical of American liberalism and more willing to speak out for a radical transformation of American values and structures in the last two years of his life. With only a few exceptions, however, Dr. King's peers rejected his new message, as have many of his successors. It is not that black clergy have lost their commitment to pur-

suing greater degrees of justice and inclusiveness in the life of the nation (see Day chapter 6), but their jeremiads are neither as courageous nor as incisive as were King's.

The relatively few progressive black clergy who did catch the echo of King's radical critique—and who were sensitive to the sentiments of the more secular Black Power movement that was fermenting even before King's death—became the chief architects of what came to be known as "black liberation theology." This new formulation of the old prophetic Christianity of the black church in turn gave impetus to the creation of a collection of organizations that sought to further the goals of empowerment and social freedom.

Politics in the Ecumenical Mode

The project of formulating a black liberation theology became the central task of the Theological Commission of the National Conference of Black Churchmen (NCBC, later named the National Conference of Black Christians in order to be inclusive of women), which was officially organized in 1967. At its founding, the NCBC had a threefold agenda. It sought rapprochement with radical activists who had parted ways with the more moderate tactics of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. It aimed to interpret Black Power for a white religious establishment that felt betrayed by the rhetoric of Black Power. And it planned to align the institutional black church more closely with the sentiments of its more progressively inclined leaders.

Early on, the founders of the NCBC recognized the need for a new language with which to approach their mission, so they created a Theological Commission for the purpose of formulating their political platform in theological terms. Rev. Gayraud Wilmore, a scholar and Presbyterian minister, was enlisted to chair the commission, which in turn invited other African American scholar-ministers to join in the endeavor. Among those asked to participate was James Cone, who had just written the first published statement of black liberation theology. Elaborating on the organization's purpose, Cone has written:

> The NCBC was created in order to transcend the denominational barriers that separated Black churches. Beyond that they created an ecumenical vision that sought solidarity with the advocates of Black power and other radical spokes-

> persons in the Black liberation struggle, persons "outside" the churches. NCBC members knew that the only way to make the Black churches a viable vehicle of Black liberation was to eliminate division among the churches through a political commitment as defined by the Black consciousness movement. Members of the NCBC were not only determined to make the Black church more relevant to the Black liberation struggle, but were equally determined to create a Black theology that would be supportive of it (1984, 17, 85).

The NCBC fell short of its ecumenical goal of uniting the entire black nation, but it succeeded in inspiring cooperative, interdenominational activism in a number of local communities that had representatives involved in the NCBC's work. Black liberation theology provided the framework for activism by ecumenical organizations across the country, from Boston and Philadelphia to Los Angeles and Oakland. The statement of purpose of the Philadelphia Council of Black Clergy set forth a representative set of objectives. The Philadelphia Council aimed to affirm the cultural contributions of black people to America, create a community power to eliminate problems within the educational system, and work for the redistribution of wealth so black people could get their fair share. They strove to organize the black community for the selection, development, and preparation of black political leadership. Moreover, they wanted to eradicate slums and rid the black community of police harassment, intimidation, and brutality. Finally, they hoped to rediscover and develop a way of life that is meaningful to oppressed people and true to the teachings of the gospel. In general, local ecumenical groups, which continued to be organized throughout the 1970s and 1980s, were more effective in influencing local policy and improving intergroup relations than they were in bringing about structural change. Some of the groups, however, also had a measure of success in creating economic institutions that led to significant housing and community development programs (Sawyer 1994).

The NCBC itself was short-lived. By the late 1970s many of its participants had become involved in another ecumenical endeavor, the Black Theology Project, which held its first major consultation in 1977. After operating erratically for several years, it began meeting on a regular basis in 1984. In 1978 two additional national movements were initiated: Partners in Ecumenism (PIE) and the Congress of National Black Churches (CNBC).

PIE was organized as an entity within the predominantly white National

Council of Churches with aspirations of fostering social change–oriented partnerships between black and white churches at both the local and national levels. For several years, PIE's annual meetings were held in Washington, D.C., and a day was set aside for members to lobby on Capitol Hill for legislation deemed to further the interests of the black community. PIE ceased to function in 1988.

The Congress of National Black Churches was made up solely of black denominations with a national constituency. By the late 1990s, membership totaled eight denominations. The CNBC was the most institutionalized of the various ecumenical groups to emerge in the decades following the civil rights and black consciousness movements. Headquartered in Washington, D.C., it has developed relationships with various federal funding agencies that agreed to underwrite the development of models of community services. These services range from immunization programs to antidrug campaigns to parenting courses, all of which can be adapted by churches in local communities. At the same time, the CNBC has sought to develop entities for self-generation of revenues in order to move black communities to a higher level of self-determination.

A particularly intriguing expression of black ecumenism is the National Black Evangelical Association (NBEA), which was organized in 1963 and consists primarily of clergy members in the evangelical wing of American Protestantism. The NBEA was devoted to defining and implementing a holistic ministry that would be inclusive of social concerns as well as spiritual affairs. While the organization predated the black liberation theology movement, it enthusiastically embraced the political and economic emphases of that theological perspective. At the same time, it has had some success in enlisting moderate white evangelicals to its cause through its work with the National Association of Evangelicals (Sawyer 1994).

Several of these organizations have moved in the direction of economic democracy that Martin Luther King was advocating prior to his death. Participants in these movements represent the most progressive element of black clergy. Nevertheless even they have continued to function, for the most part, within the parameters of liberal democracy. So, too, have the theologians who provided the blueprints for much of their building, the primary exceptions being James Cone and Cornel West. Indeed, West has preached his own jere-

miad, lamenting that most black theologians have focused on racist practices while

> remain[ing] uncritical of America's imperialist presence in Third World countries, its capitalist system of production, and its grossly unequal distribution of wealth. Therefore we may assume they find this acceptable. If this is so, then the political and socioeconomic components of Black liberation amount to racial equality before the law, equal opportunities in employment, education, and business, and economic parity with whites in median income. Surely, this situation would be better than the current dismal one, but it hardly can be viewed as Black liberation. It roughly equates liberation with American middle-class status . . . [and inclusion of] Black people within the mainstream of liberal capitalist America. If this is the social vision of Black theologians, they should drop the meretricious and flamboyant term "liberation" and adopt the more accurate and sober word "inclusion" (West 1982, 111–14).

Notwithstanding this critique, which applies alike to professional theologians and local ministers, the fact remains that many African American clergy have viewed political engagement as an avenue for fulfilling their Christian obligations. If America has yet to become a promised land of racial equity and harmony, it is not for lack of trying on the part of its black religious leaders.

Political engagement on the part of African American clergy will undoubtedly continue for the foreseeable future. That it remains a contemporary feature of ministerial life is evidenced by Day's discussion of black clergy in Philadelphia in chapter 6. As for tomorrow's involvement, certainly the choices that clergy make will shift, as they always have, as social and religious contexts change. In the last two decades the United States has undergone drastic reversals from the activist decades of the 1960s and 1970s. Many of the gains of the civil rights era were lost during the Reagan and Bush administrations, and the majority of African Americans are less well off today than they were thirty years ago. At the same time, the black community has become dichotomized, with a dramatically enlarged middle class on the one hand, and a vast underclass on the other (see Wilson 1987).

Significant apathy, insofar as activism is concerned, exists on both ends of the political spectrum of black America. Into this vacuum has come the reli-

giopolitical right of white evangelical Protestants. It is perhaps ironic that in recent years the religious right has appealed to black evangelicals, who generally have been the least politically inclined among black Christians, to join their ranks. How effective this outreach will be remains to be seen, but certainly many liberal white ministers have been dismayed to see some of their black counterparts, with whom they have worked in coalitions since the civil rights years, now being somewhat receptive to the political agenda of conservatism.

At the same time, there remains a core group of progressive black ministers who continue to act prophetically in advancing a justice agenda that includes equitable treatment for women and for gay men and lesbians. This agenda stands in diametric opposition to the agenda of the religious right. Also noteworthy are an array of other religious alternatives, including the burgeoning phenomenon of megachurches that emphasize spirituality, urban congregations that are committed to social service programs and community development, and quasi-African religions that are now being resurrected.

No doubt other religious innovations will present themselves in the decades to come. So long as the status of African American citizens continues to be defined in part by the social meaning of race, however, it is nearly inconceivable that the black religious tradition of pursuing freedom and fairness will be abandoned. Rather, this tradition will continue to run constant as a river, sometimes as a roaring torrent, sometimes quietly subterranean, but always accessible in historic moments of possibility and providence.

6 The Construction of Political Strategies among African American Clergy

KATIE DAY

The pastors of African American churches historically have played an important role in their congregations and communities. They have often been the spokespersons for people with little public voice. They have inspired their flocks to face the hardships of poverty, injustice, and racism; they have interpreted reality when "the folks" were immersed in senseless physical and social suffering and helped them to find strength for survival and abundant living. In so doing, they have played a unique role in their communities as both leaders and representatives. The authority of African American clergy has been more secure, by and large, and their status more symbolically elevated within their constituencies, than that of their brothers and sisters of European descent in ministry. Historically African American clergy have functioned as conduits for democratic participation for those who might otherwise be politically disenfranchised.

It is not surprising, then, that in a study of ten urban African American churches, the leadership of the pastor emerges as the critical factor in congregational mobilization for community economic development (see Day forthcoming). While all ten clergy were pursuing the same goal of improving the quality of life in their neighborhoods, the black pastors studied here constructed two very different strategies to approach their goal. They attracted capital for their neighborhoods either through political activism or through entrepreneurial leveraging. These two approaches, which are distinct and in some ways mutually exclusive, emerged in churches that share the same time, space, ideology, and social history. The two strategies—one that challenges the system, the other that works within it—echo earlier debates among researchers of black churches about whether the African American church is a vehicle for assimilation (into the dominant culture) or an agent of resistance and protest (Baer 1988; Baer and Singer 1992; Broom 1966; Johnstone 1971; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Marable 1983; Marx 1967; Nelsen and Nelsen 1975; Paris 1985; Shaw 1973; Turner 1973; Wilmore 1998). Obviously black pastors are not

monolithic, as Sawyer demonstrates in chapter 5. They are complex and dynamic and have, in different contexts, reflected both roles in relation to the dominant culture.

Yet the deeper question raised by this study is why, when class, ideology, and context are the same, some leaders within the black religious community utilize "disruptive" strategies (Smith 1996), while others pursue the same goals without challenging the dominant culture. The political strategy cultivates a rigorous democratic engagement in its goals and processes. Yet other clergy eschew democratic processes, opting for an entrepreneurial model, which can be effective and beneficial to constituents, but does not exercise democratic muscles.

My findings support Guth's call in chapter 3 to bring biography back into the analysis of clergy mobilization. Elements of personal history affect the approach that these African American clergy chose to take in engaging the political economy. The context created by the subcultures of their urban congregations also reinforces their "social theologies" (Guth et al. 1997), out of which they chose their strategies.

The ten churches in my study are all located within the solidly black neighborhood of North Philadelphia. This section of Philadelphia was once home to a diverse ethnic population of European immigrants and African Americans who lived near factories producing textiles, shoes, automobile parts, and all manner of goods. But the dramatic demise of manufacturing in this city, which consequently contributed to white flight, left an impoverished neighborhood considered by many to be "the worst ghetto in America" (Freeman 1990). While there are smaller subneighborhoods within North Philadelphia, there is no significant variation in racial composition or indicators of socioeconomic status across census tracts. All churches in the study share the same socioeconomic urban context and are thus confronted by the same social realities of poverty, crime, high unemployment, diminishing capital investment, inferior public schools, and inadequate health services. In the early to mid-1990s, these clergy also lived through the same shift in political opportunity, a rapid change in the local power structure during which the African American mayor and congressperson both left office. These developments greatly affected the Black Clergy Association, which had enjoyed impressive political capital through mobilizing church support for these politicians and then having access to both city hall and Capitol Hill. After this shift, clergy concerned

about the quality of life in North Philadelphia had to rethink old strategies or come up with new ones.

Five of the clergy I studied utilized *church-based community organizing* to achieve the goals of community economic development (CED). Their congregations had joined a new Industrial Areas Foundations (IAF) affiliate, Philadelphia Interfaith Action (PIA). True to its roots in the community organization of Saul Alinsky,[1] PIA pursued CED goals with impressive success in its first three years through empowerment tactics.

The other five clergy utilized what may be called the *traditional approach.* A traditionalist pastor acts as the primary entrepreneurial leader to access the power structure in order to gather resources for the development of low-income housing, commercial retail strips, capital formation (banks or credit unions), or job training and placement projects. In this approach, the goal does not involve challenging the power structure or seeking social change. In fact, its very success depends on developing entrepreneurial relationships with those in power.

The two strategies differ in four ways. In the community-organizing approach, *leadership* is shared across racial/ethnic, religious, and gender lines, as well as among clergy and lay leaders. In the traditional approach, leadership for the project resides almost entirely with the pastor. Secondly, the *parameters* of the community-organizing approach are broader than are those of the traditional strategy. The focus of the activities might benefit many sections of the city rather than just a single neighborhood. Instead of working through only one church, a broad coalition of faith groups work collaboratively. The community-organizing strategy represents a different understanding of *power*—and how to get it to produce change. While traditionalist entrepreneurs effect change through accessing the power structure, community organizers empower grassroots citizens to challenge the power structure and hold it accountable to the public. In so doing, *political change* becomes a primary goal of community organizing, as it is needed to affect the material outcomes of economic development. If a certain policy is standing in the way of getting resources to a community, that policy has to be changed. If a politician is considered obstructionist to community organizations seeking capital development, that politician will be held accountable or punished politically. In the traditional approach, by contrast, political change through the democratic process is not pursued. Political challenge would threaten

carefully crafted relationships with people in power, who can deliver much-needed resources for CED projects.

The ten clergy I studied serve churches that vary in size and differ in their denominational affiliations. Five are associated with historically African American traditions (three are community-organizing; two are traditional). The other five are members of predominantly white mainline Protestant denominations (two are community-organizing; three are traditional). The community-organizing clergy served noticeably smaller congregations. The average weekly attendance at their churches was 390; for the traditional clergy, attendance averaged 515 each week. A statistical comparison of means, however, showed that these attendance figures are not significantly different.

It became apparent in my research that the pastors were the key players in the process of strategy formulation for their congregations' CED goals. Why would some pastors gravitate to the traditional strategy while others chose the more political (and sometimes confrontational) tactic of community organizing? I conducted at least two in-depth interviews with all ten pastors, and I interviewed four of the pastors several additional times. My goal was to analyze the effects of their social location, relationships in the church and community, political history, self-identification, political perspectives, and theological beliefs on their strategy formulation.

A large portion of the initial interview was devoted to the pastors' description of their CED projects: how they were developed, the strategies they used, the goals they set, and the value commitments they saw as relevant to the projects. The physical projects of the two groups of clergy were very similar. But there were also important differences in conceptualization and action that corresponded to the two different strategies.

Most of the clergy (9 out of 10) had worked, or were working, in the development of housing for people of low and moderate income. This included a federally funded high-rise for elderly ("202 housing") and several homeless shelters, as well as tracts of rehabbed or new-construction housing units. The churches had established three community development corporations. One church had organized the oldest church-based credit union in the city, and another had been instrumental in developing a local African American bank. Two clergy had been involved in creating small shopping centers in North Philadelphia. This commercial development is arguably a more complex process than housing development, as it brings together capital from the gov-

ernment, corporate investors, and financial institutions. It relies more upon accessing power than empowering of the grassroots constituency.

Both the community-organizing clergy and their counterparts who elected not to join the coalition but to go it alone as entrepreneurs could point to impressive track records of housing units created, people sheltered, jobs generated, and capital organized. The community-organizing clergy had already been involved in these activities prior to joining the community-organizing coalition, but they had begun pursuing their goals of economic development by sharing leadership with ecumenical partners and often using confrontational rather than conciliatory tactics with those in power.

Demographic Factors and Political Strategy

The clergy of the congregations involved in community organizing were on average four years younger than were their brothers in nonaffiliated churches. This corresponds to Lincoln and Mamiya's finding that younger clergy express greater political consciousness (1990, 179, 185). Both groups had relatively long tenures at their churches, with the community-organizing clergy having somewhat shorter stays in their positions (18.8 compared to 20.6 years).

Unlike Lincoln and Mamiya's (1990) findings on the relationship between education and political consciousness, the clergy involved in community organizing had *lower levels* of education than their brothers employing less aggressive tactics. Two of the community-organizing clergy had had no formal theological training, while three did have the M.Div. as their terminal degree. In contrast, not only did all the traditional entrepreneurs have the M.Div., but four also had doctorates (two earned, two honorary).

Interestingly, only one of the ten pastors lives in the neighborhood in which his church is located. Six of the clergy live in other areas of Philadelphia, two residing in the Philadelphia suburbs and one commuting from New Jersey. Census data for the tracts in which the clergy reside show an interesting pattern. All of the pastors live in tracts that are more affluent than the citywide means. But the community-organizing clergy live in areas with significantly higher household incomes and lower poverty rates than do the traditional clergy.

Further, the clergy involved in community organizing live in areas with significantly lower proportions of African Americans than either the citywide

mean or the residential tracts of the traditional clergy. That is to say that the traditional ministers live in communities that are more solidly black; the community-organizing clergy go home to predominantly white neighborhoods.

Political Consciousness and Activism

For the most part, the clergy in this sample had been only moderately involved in the civil rights movement. Only two said they had a strong activist history in civil rights, one who was a community organizer and one who was not. Most of the pastors had been involved in electoral politics, and candidates were welcome to speak during worship services. Two had worked full time (while pastoring their churches) in politics. One traditionalist worked on a congressional staff, and one community organizer headed the Opportunities Industrial Centers (OICs), Rev. Leon Sullivan's organization dedicated to economic development in the African American community through advocacy and training.

If there was a higher level of race-based political consciousness among the traditional clergy, this did not manifest itself in distinct histories of political activism. But by attending all-black schools and living in more predominantly black neighborhoods, the traditional clergy reflected a stronger identification with the African American community. The habit of living and working in predominantly African American contexts could contribute to greater black consciousness (Shingles 1981).

Frames for Action

The second set of interviews with the ten clergy focused on questions about congregational dynamics and personal philosophies of ministry. Four polar distinctions emerged in the *modus operandi* of the two strategies: (1) clerical versus shared leadership, (2) parochial versus coalitional organization, (3) accessing power versus empowerment, and (4) accommodation versus social change.

Clerical versus Shared Leadership

All of the pastors in the community-organizing churches could be considered strong leaders. They do not manage democratically run congregations in which the majority determines the church's direction through frequent ple-

biscites. Rather, the pastors exercise power in all aspects of congregational life, including the decision to join the broad-based coalition.

Even so, four of the five clergy in the community-organizing group articulated a philosophy of leadership in which power was shared with lay people, and they acted accordingly, particularly in their CED activities. For example, one pastor was founder of his church and is unquestionably its patriarch. Despite numerous invitations to speak around the country and a staff of twelve assistants, he preaches a minimum of forty Sundays each year. "My people need to touch me," he explained (personal interview CO4, 24 June 1993). Major decisions about the church's program came directly out of his spiritual experiences. He felt God told him to buy a building that he drove past one day; an interaction with a homeless person ultimately resulted in the congregation's developing a shelter for homeless men. In explaining his security in his role, he said simply, "No one else is called to be pastor of this church" (personal interview CO4, 24 June 1993). Still, when it comes to CED activities, he defers quickly to those with more expertise. While attending a workshop on packaging proposals for federal funding, he hired one of the social workers in attendance on the spot after realizing he did not have the technical skills to broker public funding. This pastor's strong leadership is tempered by his own self-critique: "Ego can kill a church" (personal interview CO4, 24 June 1993). Later, in discussing his understanding that leadership should be shared, at least outside of spiritual matters, he said, "So much could be accomplished if we didn't care who gets the credit, because really, Jesus should" (personal interview CO4, 24 June 1993).

Three of the other community-organizing pastors also reflected perspectives that preserved the unique authority of the pastor while seeking to develop leadership for CED activities from within the congregation. One pastor saw himself as a "cheerleader" and "networker" rather than an administrator (personal interview CO2, 28 May 1993). In his church, the leaders of CED projects are frequently recognized and asked to speak. Another admitted that he was "90 percent of the driving force behind [my church's] involvement in [the coalition]" (personal interview CO1, 17 May 1993). Still, he was trying to cultivate a "remnant" of leaders within the congregation who could share the leadership. Another said, "It's not difficult to get people involved in [the coalition]. There's no great leadership here. All you have to do is to tell them what's going on [regarding public issues]" (personal interview CO3, 12 April 1993).

For some clergy, involvement in the community-organizing coalition had a *transforming effect* on their understanding of leadership, moving them away from sole authority to shared leadership. One pastor admitted that initially his congregation's membership in the coalition came solely out of his leadership, but reflected

> I was into my power mode then. I didn't understand. In the Baptist system you spend a number of years fighting to get power. Then your ministry expands, and you have all this additional activity as well as keeping the church going. I was scared not to be doing everything. I didn't trust people to take leadership. Then I realized we have a lot of talented leadership around here. Now, since ten-day training, things are different. It has really impacted my leadership. For example, I don't have to chair every meeting. I don't want to. We rotate chairs, and that person is responsible for the agenda and the whole meeting. We research issues, then vote on them, hold people accountable to carry them out, just like in [the coalition]. This has been an easy transition for me because I was tired—I was doing too much. I was doing everything! I was moving in this direction [of shared leadership] before the training, but I didn't have a language for it. Now I'm where Moses was in Numbers: I'm trying to find my seventy leaders. (Personal interview CO3, 12 April 1993)

The exception among the community-organizing clergy was the pastor of a church on the fringe of the coalition. In describing the church's extensive history of CED activity, he did not mention any leadership, or even involvement, beyond himself. Throughout the narrative of commercial development, he presented himself as the sole broker of "five funding streams" for the project (personal interview CO5, 10 May 1993). He did not anticipate lay people taking the initiative: "Any community concern comes from me."

The traditional entrepreneurial clergy group expressed views on leadership that were similar to this anomalous community-organizing pastor. Four of the five had closely guarded their pastoral leadership, not only in the spiritual domain but in CED activities as well, bringing housing and commercial development projects into being almost single-handedly. One worked with a small coalition of other African American clergy in developing fifteen housing units. Two others brokered millions of dollars from federal and private sources working with only one fiscal agent, who was not a member of the congregation. Another had organized a Model Cities housing development pro-

gram and cochaired it with a community member. The congregations supported these efforts, gave them financial support, and often became involved in their management boards upon completion.

The traditional pastor-as-solo-actor strategy was rooted in understandings about leadership that the pastors expressed in the interviews. As one pastor said, "The project [202 housing] was worthy, and was needed. That's what drove me. Part of my job is to get everything in line" (personal interview T1, 13 April 1993). In the view of another pastor, "In the black church, the pastor is the CEO. There is not as much lay leadership as in European congregations. A dominant pastor [model] works. . . . Lay people don't have the time or the commitment to do what the pastor does, and pastors won't be laity-led. . . . It's from the African chieftain, the pastor as chief of the tribe" (personal interview T4, 20 April 1993). This pastor has a relatively high proportion of professionals in his congregation. Still, as he goes about his work of developing housing in a clergy-only coalition, he believes it is important to report to the congregation, but not to involve them in the project. "Lay people don't have the time or the interest to meet with politicians" (personal interview T4, 20 April 1993).

One pastor expressed awe at the authority he enjoyed: "Sometimes I'm frightened by the power. There is a tremendous amount of loyalty and trust in me. They [the members of his church] don't challenge me" (personal interview T1, 13 April 1993). He felt that it was important to educate the congregation about the role of the pastor as both prophet and priest, yet at the same time to empower lay people to take over some of the religious activities. "You can spend all your time in the priestly function. It's not productive. I train others to do this so I'm free to do other things. Anybody can do a wedding or a baptism" (personal interview T1, 13 April 1993). This pastor described his role as "advocate" or "representative" for the congregation. As such, the "other things" he was "free to do" included developing elder housing, working with an exclusive group in founding a black bank, and amassing enough political capital to be considered the dean of African American churches in Philadelphia in political as well as ecclesiastical circles.

The two groups of pastors in the study reflected different understandings of leadership, and different modes of operating as leaders. Four of the five community-organizing ministers expressed a commitment to sharing leadership with their members not only in CED activities but in other aspects of the

church's program as well. In contrast, the traditional clergy and the pastor of the community-organizing church that was less involved in the coalition described their leadership styles differently: they were more comfortable operating independently and not sharing responsibility for the direction and implementation of programs with their membership. This came out of an assumption that lay people were neither interested in nor capable of taking leadership in CED, or that the African American pastor as the leader takes sole responsibility, acting as representative of the congregation in the public arena.

It is interesting to note that in the history of the Philadelphia community-organizing coalition, the issue of clerical versus shared leadership dissuaded some clergy from affiliating. A small group of African American clergy challenged the commitment of the parent organization to sharing leadership among clergy and nonordained members. Pastors who had issued the challenge backed off from involvement with the new chapter when the word came back that shared leadership was a nonnegotiable tenet of the organization. This reticence was due in large part to the parent organization's commitment to mutual representational leadership, a key element in democratic process.

Parochial versus Coalitional Organizing

In many ways, the choice to organize solely from the base of one's congregation rather than joining a coalition is an extension of the two different orientations toward leadership. The six pastors most comfortable with elitist (clerical) leadership had developed projects in which their own churches were the only (or at least the major) player. Again, the distinctions between the community-organizing clergy and the traditional clergy are clear. But in this case the rationale given was framed more in pragmatic than in theoretical language.

The same four community-organizing clergy who preferred to share leadership in CED projects were also convinced that participation in a coalition would increase their effectiveness. As one pastor explained, "A coalition can have a major impact. An ecumenical, multiracial coalition has more political and economic clout. The mayor doesn't want to fight the whole religious community" (personal interview CO3, 12 April 1993).

Pastors who were involved with the coalition felt that their membership was in their best interest. They had no doubt that eventually the power of the coalition would focus on the issues literally closest to home: creating housing,

addressing blight, and directing public resources to their neighborhood. In several cases, CED projects begun by a congregation were deferred so that energy could be directed to citywide issues through coalition activism.

Working in coalition stretched the sensibilities of many of these African American pastors. For example, after a synagogue joined, there was a struggle within the organization about addressing Jesus in the prayers at their meetings. A compromise was struck, but for some of the pastors the issue was not resolved at a personal level. Still, they displayed a willingness to transcend religious differences in order to focus on the common goal of change in Philadelphia.

The traditional clergy were also operating out of political pragmatism when choosing parochial strategies. While several offered visions of how at least several churches could work together, they had not pursued it. They expressed the assumption that joining a coalition might dilute the effort. Their development projects usually took place very close to their church buildings. This preserved the intense geographical focus of each church's ministry, even when a majority of members commuted to church from outside the neighborhood. Despite the criticisms of outsiders that the parochially oriented pastors were egotistical, competitive, or engaging in empire building, this was not apparent in their own articulation of their rationale. In explaining why he chose to put his time and energy into housing development in the neighborhood rather than participating in a coalition, one pastor explained: "We're more effective than groups like BCA [Black Clergy Association]. They are too broad, too regional in their focus. They don't have zeal for particular parts of the city" (personal interview T4, 20 April 1993).

Another pastor was not concerned by the fact that three other Baptist churches within four blocks were also working on CED projects in the neighborhood they shared. For him, coalitions (even small ones) required too much time. He felt that he "walks a tightrope" when participating in outside groups, because he is always looking out for his congregation's interest and hoping to direct resources to his church and its immediate neighborhood (personal interview T1, 13 April 1993).

The pastor of a large church involved in a major commercial development project couched his explanation of his parochial strategy in the language of self-help. "Now in Philadelphia we have got to do things for ourselves. We need a moral revolution, a revival, and we need to develop economic self-help. We

have got to get people saved and safe" (personal interview T3, 18 September 1993). His church was working intensely on both fronts in its corner of the city. While only 18.8 percent of his congregation walked to church in this densely populated neighborhood, the ministry had a geographical focus that might be compromised by bringing in partners or expanding the service area.

He was one of several pastors who said, "If the black church doesn't do it for the folks, it won't get done" (personal interview T3, 18 September 1993). All the pastors in the study were driven by the question of how best to achieve their goals. For some, working alone and in the local neighborhood was the best way to serve the congregation's interest, so they chose not to join the coalition. For the community-organizing clergy, the increased power of a coalition seemed a more effective route to improving the quality of life, locally as well as regionally. The challenges of pluralism and the resulting compromises of a coalition were considered worthwhile in light of expanding their power base.

Accessing Power versus Empowerment

As pragmatists seeking very tangible changes for the poor, all ten pastors ventured into secular politics and had highly developed understandings of power. There was a clear distinction between their two general approaches to power: *accessing* established power or *empowering* (politically activating) the grassroots. All of the traditional clergy and the one community-organizing pastor who remained on the fringe of the coalition described how they brought about economic development by depending on their personal contacts with people in power. They expressed pride in being a part of that power structure. Several maintained that they were among a small group of clergy whom the mayor might personally call. Others spoke of having important relationships with judges, politicians at the federal and state level, and powerful actors within the financial community. While one pastor admitted feeling like "we're the 'house folks' to these people" (personal interview T4, 20 April 1993), there was a sense of reality to the traditional strategy in the sense that this is how the game is played. "There are four things that control our destiny," explained the coalition pastor with traditional leanings. "Insurance, money, real estate, and education. In order to get ahead, we [African Americans] need to get a whole lot more of all of these" (personal interview CO5, 10 May 1993). He pursued all four resources by developing contacts and sitting on several corporate boards. He had joined the coalition to add another route of access

to power, but balked when confrontational tactics were employed: "I've been out front so long; I don't need to sit on stage [at coalition assemblies to which politicians are invited and often challenged]. But I've told the people on the stage to be careful. . . . Someone needs to confront [Mayor Edward] Rendell, [but] it won't be me. I'll publicly support him. Let someone else confront him" (personal interview CO5, 10 May 1993). Moreover, accessing power often meant personal compromise. Those utilizing the traditional approach described the cost of protecting their hard-won political capital. "We need to subjugate our anger," one pastor explained in describing how he sought change through cultivating relationships with those in power (personal interview T5, 5 June 1993).

Four of the community-organizing clergy spoke of power in very different terms. In describing how they pursued their CED goals, these pastors stressed their own heightened public profiles rather than their contacts with the power structure. While their own prominence could have afforded them personal relationships with those in the power structure, they had not pursued such ties. In the course of working with the coalition, they had encountered the mayor, administrative officials, and powerful players within the financial sector, both in public forums and in closed-door meetings. Still, they operated as representatives of the coalition, not as individuals. Because they had not been previously enmeshed in the power structure, they had no personal political capital to protect and no need to subjugate their frustrations. Acting on behalf of grassroots constituents, they could maintain independence in their relationships with those in power, remaining free either to collaborate or to criticize.

The strategic approach to power, as articulated by the community-organizing clergy, focused on "organizing people" (for public protests, small-group "house meetings," or ongoing work groups) and "organizing money." They felt this strategy was more effective for bringing about change and was also better for the institutional interests of the church. "If the church doesn't deal with power [in the terms above], it won't attract young people. The church needs to be about power if it is going to attract men" (personal interview CO2, 28 May 1993).

The grassroots empowerment approach is substantially more accommodating of confrontation. As one pastor put it, "We want enough power to oppose policymakers, to address injustice and corruption, 'by any means necessary,' like Malcolm said" (personal interview CO1, 17 May 1993). A similar view

was that "we need to fight the establishment, to bring tension to a head. If the heat's too much, then get out of the kitchen" (personal interview CO4, 24 June 1993).

The four community-organizing pastors espousing the empowerment approach were tapping into an ideological resonance in the coalition about the proper role of the church in society and a suspicion toward the power structure. These ideas were reinforced through participation in the coalition and particularly through the training process. The coalition's approach to power and social change was also different from their seminary training. "[The coalition] is not afraid of power, but the church is. . . . [The coalition] is helping me to understand power theologically" (personal interview CO1, 17 May 1993), one pastor said.

For four of the community-organizing clergy, the empowerment perspective was rooted more in experience than in theoretical commitment. When evaluating the role of African American churches in social change, they concluded that accessing power had not gotten their constituent communities very far down the path of economic development. They felt demoralized by the poverty and discrimination that persists despite the gains of the civil rights movement.

On the other hand, some pastors still saw the traditional access-to-power position as the most viable and realistic way to broker enough political power and resources to achieve their development goals. They felt that clergy alone could gain enough status to negotiate with the power structure by representing a large, if silent, mass base of voters. As one pastor explained, "I haven't given up on city hall. But I want to bring power to the table, and not come begging. There is a new movement of black power, and that is when churches buy power" (personal interview T3, 18 September 1993).

In contrast, those representing the empowerment position do not believe that delivering a block of votes on Election Day is enough. They are much more concerned with the process of governing between elections. Their focus is less on electing officeholders than on expanding the number of people who can articulate a community's concern and holding officials accountable in the public forum. A large and diverse group of people undertaking a public action is a show of strength that provides face-to-face interaction with the power structure. Community-organizing clergy believe this strategy is much more effective than promising a disembodied number of votes every four years.

Accommodation versus Social Change

All the pastors I interviewed reflected both social and individual dimensions in their interpretive paradigms of what creates problems and what strategies should be used to address them. Not even the most individualistically oriented pastor could be described simply as accepting of the status quo. Nor were any of the pastors uncritical of the political and economic system. Still, paradigms emerged that weighted either the individual or the system more heavily. For example, one community-organizing pastor said, "I think poverty is caused by our capitalist system, which creates a heart for injustice, rather than community. I also think that sin is at work in personal choices, like the single-parent homes. I agreed with [former Vice President Dan] Quayle's analysis of the family. The problem was that he had the power to change the situation, but he didn't use it. Government is hypocritical because it influences the deterioration of the family. I'm opposed to welfare [which this pastor elsewhere described as 'institutional slavery'] but I'm more opposed to starving" (personal interview CO3, 12 April 1993).

For this pastor, there was a dialectical relationship between individual and social sources of evil. In his eyes, the economic system influences the individual, and individuals are often sinful in their choices. While individuals are responsible for their behavior, however, the government is responsible for meeting basic human needs and supporting family structures. The government is not morally neutral; instead it becomes responsible and accountable as it becomes an agent of destructive social trends. In the pulpit, this pastor almost exclusively stresses personal spiritual change and growth. But when working on economic development, he seeks to change the policies and processes for allocation of public resources rather than trying to shape individuals to fit into the system.

The other community-organizing clergy shared this paradigm of giving systemic analysis and social change more weight than the individual in their public ministry. One pastor said of the church's mission, "We have to find ways of being nurturing while also being prophetic and seeking social change. Otherwise, we're just holding hands in the darkness" (personal interview CO2, 28 May 1993). Another reported that involvement in community organizing had helped him "to look at the church with new eyes," as part of the system that needs to be changed. "In trying to understand why [social problems] happen,

I'm finding that the church and the city will be changed simultaneously" (personal interview CO1, 17 May 1993).

For four of the traditional clergy and one community-organizing pastor, though, the individual is the focus of economic development efforts. They did not want to tamper with the system, even though they would admit it has not been fair to African Americans. These pastors frequently stressed education—motivating individuals to pursue it as well as making it more accessible. One pastor said of his personal history, "I was immersed in getting an education instead of civil rights. My goal has been to become more self-directing so that I can change the system from within. If I do a better job, you'll respect me." This pastor was involved in leveraging public and corporate investment in housing in North Philadelphia. His education and contacts had enabled him to do this work. He hoped to continue in this vein until "all of North Philadelphia is redeveloped" (personal interview T4, 20 April 1993). But he never criticized institutional or social factors that might have contributed to the deplorable housing conditions, and he never spoke of a need for systemic change. Instead he felt it was the responsibility of individuals within the economically disadvantaged community (in this case, a few pastors) to work within the system to get what is needed.

One community-organizing pastor had been attracted to the organization only because it could mobilize more people in his congregation (personal interview CO5, 10 May 1993). Otherwise, he remained somewhat skeptical and ambivalent toward the coalition. His priority for outreach was education, although he had also been involved in housing, commercial development, and job training. This stated priority was rooted in his perspective on the government and economic system, which, while critical, resists strategies directed at changing it. At a pragmatic level, he wanted African Americans to redirect their energy and anger into working their way into the system. "We [African Americans] need to get rid of all the obstacles that keep us seeing things differently. We need to appreciate who we are, but also who others are. . . . We can't let the truth [about racism] create evil in us, or anger and violence" (personal interview CO5, 10 May 1993).

The pastors moved toward two different poles in their perspectives on change: some felt that it was more important to equip the African American community to work within the system, while others wanted to see the rules of the game changed. But as with their views on power, these views were rooted

in pragmatism. Those who did not want to challenge the status quo had no sense that the system of distribution was fair. They were often as sensitive to institutionalized injustice as their brothers who articulated the "change" position. But they did not feel that change was viable, and in their eyes, energy expended on changing the system was energy wasted. Better to put that energy toward preparing people to participate in the system, with the hope that through infiltration the system would eventually be changed.

The North Philadelphia clergy in this study were similar in many ways beyond congregational context. They shared a common commitment to improving the physical and spiritual well-being of both their church members and their neighbors. In the broadest terms, they acted in the ways they felt would be most effective in addressing the racial and class-based inequalities they perceived in their community. Except for one pastor who espoused a much more liberal theology, the clergy articulated theological positions commonly identified with evangelical and even fundamentalist traditions. They displayed consensus in their understandings of conversion, salvation, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the Bible, whether they were from mainline Protestant denominations (United Methodist, Presbyterian, American Baptist) or traditional black church families (National Baptist, Church of God in Christ).

The two approaches to CED, therefore, did not come out of theological difference. Rather the two paradigms represent competing social theologies (Guth et al. 1997). Those who chose to affiliate with the community-organizing coalition espoused the democratic belief that leadership should be shared. They believed that the politically marginalized grassroots can and should be mobilized into a political force. They felt that religious and racial boundaries should be transcended for the purpose of political expediency. Finally, they agreed that change is possible and should be sought not only in individuals and policies but in the very systems that formulate those policies.

Those clergy who had opted not to join the coalition articulated a different social theology. As spiritual leaders of congregations and their representatives outside the church, they felt that clergy can and should become the major actors in leveraging resources to the community. They also felt that the most effective way to do this is for the clergy to access the power structure. In particular, the black church should work independently and locally so that efforts are not diluted. The system from which resources are sought should

not be challenged. While their participation in CED efforts has led some pastors to transform and intensify these social theologies, my interviews confirm they preceded the construction of a strategy.

Evidence of the differing social theologies of community-organizing clergy and traditional clergy emerged in the metaphorical language they employed in communicating their views. The community organizers utilized images of morality and conflict: justice, war, sin, evil, the devil, and holy power. For example, one pastor used war imagery in responding to a question about the possibility of neighborhood revitalization: "[We win] only if we identify the enemy and go to war. Everything else must be postponed. There is no volunteer army, so we need to draft soldiers. But it is the difficult things that God does best. And there is always a remnant" (personal interview CO1, 17 May 1993).

In contrast, traditional clergy borrowed language from the corporate world in their narratives. Several offered the model of the church as entrepreneur, and others spoke about "negotiation," "leadership," "integrity," and "realism." They saw the church as an institution and clergy as its CEOs. The metaphorical language betrayed the deeply held views of how the pastors interpreted their place in the world. (Community-organizing clergy, by contrast, perceived themselves to be on a quest: they felt a sense of moral warfare in confronting and transforming the political and economic system.) Further, the traditional clergy had an expectation of succeeding. They did not see the system as quite so alienating. When considering social location within the broader culture, it cannot be argued that this was because they had benefited more from the system. In fact, because they resided in more segregated census tracts, the opposite argument might be made. Nor did they consider the system to be ethically beyond reform. Rather, seeking change in the broad system seemed less realistic than did bringing change to one corner of North Philadelphia.

The pastors' decision-making processes were not simple—these were not disembodied, purely rational choices. Each pastor's social theology was affected by his previous socialization. Those who had lived and worked in more diverse contexts were not resistant to multicultural and ecumenical coalitions. The traditional clergy, on the other hand, had more social capital within the black community—they were older, had somewhat larger churches, longer tenures, and more formal education. Moreover, they had some currency

within the power structure that may have contributed to a strong sense of personal security and autonomy from other clergy. For the most part, the traditional pastors communicated that did not feel they needed to work in coalition. Instead they had the personal and institutional resources and connections to effect the change they sought by working alone. Their singular identification with the African American community was expressed in their choices about housing and education. In contrast, those who chose the strategy of community organizing had more to gain by working through a coalition. Their churches were smaller, and they were not as entrenched in the power structure. They were eager to learn new skills and to increase their power base.

It is difficult to evaluate which of the two approaches is more effective. The traditional approach has been dominant among North Philadelphia clergy since Rev. Leon Sullivan began his CED work there in the 1960s. Faith-based coalitional community organizing has emerged as a recent option for African American clergy. Therefore, more housing construction and commercial development is attributable to the traditional approach, although the community organization (Philadelphia Interfaith Action) has an effective tract record in its short history. Making the comparison even more complex is the difference in goals. In the traditional approach, the goals are quantifiable—housing built, capital organized, jobs produced. In church-based community organizing, empowerment for democratic participation is the goal, and CED merely the means. This outcome is much more difficult to measure, which makes comparisons of the effectiveness of the two models difficult.

Currently within the African American religious community, these two models represent growing trends. There is a renaissance of entrepreneurial CED as well as a discovery of community organizing. It is possible that over time the two streams, now distinct, might fuse into a singular approach. But the distinctiveness is embedded in competing social theologies that at this moment appear mutually exclusive.

7 Clergy as Political Actors in Urban Contexts

SUE E. S. CRAWFORD AND
LAURA R. OLSON

Clergy are simultaneously citizens, religious professionals, and institutional leaders. As a result, their political attitudes and behavior are shaped by a myriad of forces. In chapter 2, Jelen synthesizes much of the literature that explains how denominational traditions and theology compel different types of clergy to identify themselves with divergent political agendas. These differences also constrain some clergy from participating in politics while encouraging others to seek such activity vigorously. Jelen also notes that socioeconomic factors and skills influence clergy's political participation, just as is the case among the population at large.

This chapter moves beyond individual and theological variables, which influence clergy's general disposition toward political action, to emphasize mobilization at the local level. As Guth notes in chapter 3, we have much to learn about how and why clergy become mobilized for political action. Here we test several hypotheses about the mobilization mechanisms that are most effective in lower-income urban neighborhoods. We therefore contribute to the discussion that runs throughout this volume about the impact of the contexts within which clergy work and live on their political choices.

We show that in one American city (Indianapolis), clergy who work in neighborhoods with relatively high percentages of low-income residents participate *more* in local political activities associated with low-income assistance, crime prevention, and neighborhood development than do clergy who work in higher-income neighborhoods. This is true even though congregations in more affluent areas tend to provide more community services and activities (Hodgkinson, Weitzman, and Kirsch 1993; Green 1997), and despite the fact that clergy serving in low-income neighborhoods are likely to have fewer personal resources than clergy serving in more affluent neighborhoods. To explain this finding, we test for evidence of several mobilization mechanisms that push clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods to higher rates of

political participation as compared with their colleagues in other neighborhoods. Although our data come from one city only, previous research (Olson 1997, 2000) has also shown that clergy in Milwaukee who serve in low-income neighborhoods are more politically active than are suburban clergy, which confirms that higher rates of participation among these clergy is not just an Indianapolis phenomenon.

Political Participation and Mobilization

Why might clergy in lower-income areas be more inclined to participate in politics? To explain varying degrees of political participation, scholars traditionally have turned to individual-level factors such as education and income. Taken together, these explanations have been labeled the "standard socioeconomic model" of political participation (Verba and Nie 1972). According to this model, citizens who lack socioeconomic resources are unlikely to participate in politics unless they have strong feelings of group consciousness. Group consciousness develops when members of a specific group come to believe that they are oppressed by American society and that they therefore ought to take collective political action to seek justice (Miller et al. 1981; Shingles 1981).

In light of this traditional model of political participation, there is no reason to expect clergy who serve in lower-income neighborhoods to participate more heavily in politics than clergy in areas that have access to more socioeconomic resources. Other than a few historic urban churches that now find themselves situated in lower-income neighborhoods, churches in neighborhoods that lack socioeconomic resources probably are not able to pay their clergy salaries commensurate with salaries in large suburban churches. Consequently, clergy who serve in low-income neighborhoods may be of lower socioeconomic status themselves. The standard socioeconomic model of participation would posit that they would participate less in politics than their more affluent suburban colleagues.

But political participation recently has been shown to depend on two key resources in addition to money: time and civic skills (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Verba et al. 1993a, 1993b). As Jelen notes in chapter 2, all clergy possess some combination of these three resources. Taken together, money, time, and civic skills represent potential energy for clergy to participate in politics. Still, there is no reason to assume that

clergy who serve in low-income areas have more civic skills than do those who serve in more affluent areas.

The higher levels of political activity by clergy who serve low-income neighborhoods in Milwaukee hold when controls for race are imposed. So the relationship cannot be explained as a result of African American group consciousness or traditions of political activism in historically black churches (see Sawyer chapter 5) located in areas of the city with greater concentrations of African Americans (Olson 1997, 2000). This suggests that the social circumstances of clergy in lower-income areas may bear an important relationship to their rates of political participation.

The literature does not account well for high levels of political participation among clergy in impoverished urban areas. Some scholars have examined the effects of people's surroundings, particularly the neighborhoods within which they reside and work, on their political participation (Huckfeldt 1986; Huckfeldt, Plutzer, and Sprague 1993; Huckfeldt et al. 1995; Huckfeldt and Sprague 1987). Others have focused attention on the political contexts that emerge within churches (Huckfeldt and Sprague 1995; Jelen 1992b; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988, 1990) and the ways in which informal relationships among church "discussion partners" can shape political attitudes (Djupe 1997; Gilbert 1993). But the specific impact of neighborhood context on clergy's political behavior has not received much attention (Olson and Jelen 1998).

Hypotheses

In this chapter we examine the effect of the income level of the neighborhood surrounding a church or synagogue on the level of local political participation by clergy. We test whether Indianapolis clergy who serve low-income neighborhoods are more politically active than their colleagues in other neighborhoods. We then consider several mobilization mechanisms that may explain why clergy in low-income areas participate at higher rates. What is it about working in a low-income neighborhood that mobilizes clergy for political participation? If clergy who work in lower-income neighborhoods are more active—despite the probability that they are themselves of lower socioeconomic status, and despite the probability that their congregations are no more active—then powerful mobilizing factors must be at work encouraging them to invest their time and energy in political activity.

We evaluate five different hypotheses about the relationship between low-income neighborhood contexts and higher rates of political participation by clergy. The *self-selection hypothesis* posits that the relationship exists only because clergy who are interested in political activity self-select into congregations in low-income areas. The *personal stake hypothesis* holds that the relationship exists (at least in part) because clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods are more aware of social problems that require immediate political action and because they are more likely to feel that they have a personal stake in ameliorating those problems. The *membership hypothesis* posits that the relationship exists (at least in part) because clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods will be likely to have low-income members in their congregations who expect political leadership from their clergy. The *leadership vacuum hypothesis* suggests that the relationship exists (at least in part) because low-income neighborhoods have relatively few professionals other than clergy available to assume leadership roles in nonprofit and government programs. The *government attention hypothesis* holds that the relationship exists (at least in part) because clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods are more likely to be asked to participate. Clergy could be encouraged by government officials to participate, or people who are concerned about what the government is doing could push clergy to step up their involvement (Crawford 1995; Kordesh 1986).

Three of these hypotheses flow from current developments in mobilization theory. Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) argue that political mobilization springs from the social nature of political life. They discuss two types of mobilization: issue mobilization and organizational mobilization. People may be mobilized to participate in politics through issue mobilization when they feel that they have a personal stake in an issue that compels them to become involved. Our personal stake hypothesis suggests an issue mobilization mechanism. People are also mobilized by organizations either directly (when they are specifically asked) or indirectly (when they belong to social networks in which political participation is esteemed). The membership hypothesis and the government attention hypothesis are based on organizational mechanisms; the government attention hypothesis suggests a direct organizational mobilization mechanism like that discussed by Rosenstone and Hansen, while the membership hypothesis suggests a different kind of organizational mobilization mechanism, one that is not driven by political elites.

The leadership vacuum hypothesis draws upon work in the rational choice tradition that examines the conditions under which individuals should be expected to engage in collective political action despite the "rational" incentives to "free ride" by letting someone else do the work. One condition that leads people to participate in collective action is a conviction that their specific contributions will determine whether a collective goal can be reached. In this scenario the person believes that his or her contribution is not only helpful but essential (Kerr 1996). Our leadership vacuum hypothesis is based on the possibility that some clergy may feel they are among a small handful of leaders in low-income neighborhoods with sufficient training and leadership skills to ensure the success of political efforts on behalf of their neighborhoods—and consequently that their participation is essential.

Notice that the mobilization mechanisms tested here are quite different from the direct organizational mobilization of Southern Baptist clergy discussed by Guth in chapter 9 and the issue mobilization of women clergy discussed in chapter 4. Our mechanisms also differ from those discussed in *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997). The mobilization hypotheses tested here all focus on mechanisms that are contextual, specifically those that appear to have more effect for clergy who work in lower-income neighborhoods. Consequently, we do not examine partisan and ideological mobilization mechanisms. There is no compelling reason to expect such mobilizing mechanisms to be stronger for clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods (although we might expect them to be more liberal or more strongly identified with the Democratic Party). Similarly, we do not examine specific religious motivations for these clergy to participate in politics. Although interview evidence and common sense lead to the conclusion that religious motivation is certainly relevant for clergy, there is no compelling reason to assume that ministers who serve in low-income neighborhoods have significantly stronger religious motivations than their colleagues who serve in more affluent areas.

Data and Method

Our data are drawn from a study of local political participation by clergy in Indianapolis (Crawford 1995), and they provide measures of clergy participation and several contextual variables.[1] We operationalize the concept of participation as the total number of activities in which each minister or rabbi

engaged in three specific areas: low-income assistance, neighborhood development, and crime prevention. This measure includes a broad range of nonprofit and government activities including work with government-sponsored programs, nonprofit activities designed to address social problems, and various forms of advocacy. "Cue-giving" activities, such as praying for a candidate or talking about a political topic in a sermon, are not included. The Indianapolis data set also includes measures of several other aspects of neighborhood context that we use to test our hypotheses: census data and information about jurisdictional boundaries for government programs.[2]

Our analysis combines Poisson multiple regression with the classic elaboration paradigm (Kendall and Lazarsfeld 1950).[3] The elaboration paradigm guides us in developing the statistical models and interpreting the results. It provides a logic by which to understand the relationship between two variables (in this case, the relationship between the income level of the neighborhood and the level of clergy participation) by examining what happens to that relationship when a test variable (in this case, an hypothesized mobilization mechanism variable) is added to the model.

If the mobilization mechanism weakens the original relationship, *and* if it can both explain why a minister works in a low-income neighborhood *and* why he or she has a higher rate of political activity, then according to the elaboration paradigm, the original relationship between low-income neighborhood context and higher rates of participation is spurious. If the relationship is spurious, then we must conclude that working in a low-income neighborhood does not really mobilize clergy. Instead, it only *appears* to do so, because something else is causing active clergy to work in low-income neighborhoods. The self-selection hypothesis is of this nature. If the self-selection hypothesis explains away the relationship between neighborhood context and clergy participation, then we must conclude that the relationship between neighborhood income and clergy activism is only spurious.

According to the elaboration paradigm, if a mobilization mechanism variable is added that reasonably could cause higher rates of clergy activity but that could *not* cause activist clergy to locate in low-income neighborhoods, then the weakening of the original relationship indicates that the test variable *intervenes* in the relationship between neighborhood income and clergy activism. The test variable is a mechanism *through which* lower-income neighborhood contexts compel higher rates of political activism among clergy. The

discovery of an intervening variable does not mean that the original relationship was incorrect (as would be the case with spuriousness), but instead that the relationship works through these mechanisms. The personal stake hypothesis, the membership hypothesis, the leadership vacuum hypothesis, and the government attention hypothesis all test for such intervening or mobilization mechanisms.

The Neighborhood Income Effect

Table 7.1 reports results from a model of the rates of clergy's political participation, including individual and denominational variables that affect the level of clergy involvement in local policy (Crawford 1995), as well as the low-income neighborhood context variable. The results indicate that Indianapolis clergy who serve low-income neighborhoods participate at higher rates than do clergy who serve in other neighborhood contexts. The table shows the results for neighborhood-level variables, which is measured in this case by the low-income neighborhood index. The results indicate that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between a neighborhood's poverty level and the rates of political activity among its clergy.[4]

It is important to note that we tested the model presented in table 7.1 with a variable that measured the extent to which a neighborhood could be considered African American. In that test, the race variable was not even close to statistical significance, which means that the relationship between low-income neighborhood context and participation is not simply an artifact of the presence of African American churches (with their traditional emphasis on political activity).

Might we find higher levels of clergy activism in low-income neighborhoods than in more affluent areas because clergy simply engage in different types of activity? Perhaps the specific types of activities we examine are most relevant for central-city clergy. Although the problems associated with our three issue-areas (low-income assistance, neighborhood development, and crime prevention) may be most pressing in low-income neighborhoods, clergy who work in more affluent neighborhoods may also wish to address these issues politically. After all, fighting poverty is one activity around which most clergy can rally, despite their other differences (Crawford 1995; Olson 2000). Perhaps middle-income neighborhoods present clergy with more op-

TABLE 7.1. *Total Number of Clergy Activities, by Low-Income Neighborhood Index*

	Incident Rate Ratio	Standard Error
Low-income neighborhood index	1.13**	0.069
Number of clergy's organizational ties	1.15***	0.040
Clergy has other employment in addition to clergy position(s)	0.45***	0.089
Clergy serves two or more congregations	1.28	0.226
Clergy considers denominational leaders' reactions when making choices about activities	1.26**	0.136
Model chi-square (5)	51.16***	

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1993 surveys in Indianapolis. $N = 180$.

NOTE: $^{**}p < 0.05$; $^{***}p < 0.01$. The table lists the results of a Poisson regression in terms of incident rate ratios. The incident rate ratio is the rate at which the dependent variable increases as the independent variable increases. Values close to 1 indicate very little change. Values over 1 indicate a positive relationship. Values below 1 indicate a negative relationship.

portunities to join citizen efforts to fight poverty than would be the case in low-income neighborhoods. Neighborhood associations and crime watch associations are more likely to flourish in neighborhoods with plenty of middle-income homeowners. So higher levels of activism among clergy who serve in low-income neighborhoods cannot simply be dismissed as a reflection of the specific types of political activity that we examine.

The Self-Selection Hypothesis

Contextual analysis assumes that there is something about political context that influences political behavior, and that statistical relationships between contextual variables and measures of political behavior reflect that influence. Since we found a positive and statistically significant relationship between low-income neighborhood context and political participation in Indianapolis, we assume that there is something about working in a low-income area that influences the political behavior of clergy and leads them to participate at higher rates.

One important counterexplanation for the relationship between neighborhood context and high rates of participation is self-selection. Clergy who are interested in political activity—especially those who want to further a social justice agenda—may also be most interested in working in low-income neighborhoods. They may feel a special calling to serve low-income neighborhoods, or denominational leaders may be more likely to assign them to work there. Under any of these scenarios, at least part of the rela-

tionship that we find between neighborhood context and participation would be spurious.

When we add a variable to our model that measures whether a minister is expected to engage in activities outside of religious education and worship,[5] the strength of the relationship between low-income neighborhood context and participation is weakened and is no longer statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Critics might argue at this point that this result shows that the original relationship was indeed spurious. It does appear that self-selection explains at least part of the original relationship between neighborhood context and clergy activism. This statistical finding is further supported by interview evidence from a small number of Indianapolis clergy who argued that they chose to locate in lower-income neighborhoods because of their interest in political activism.

Nevertheless, the model still indicates that the probability that there is not a relationship between neighborhood income and the rates of participation by Indianapolis clergy is less than 10 percent. Despite the fact that self-selection appears to explain a part of the relationship, enough evidence remains of a relationship between low-income neighborhood context and higher rates of participation to continue to ask why that relationship exists.

The Personal Stake Hypothesis

On the basis of Rosenstone and Hansen's work (1993), it is reasonable to look for mobilizing factors that may cause clergy who work in lower-income areas to become more aware of issues in which they feel a personal stake. Clergy who work in low-income contexts are more aware of the immediacy of social problems than are clergy in more affluent suburbs (Olson 2000). Interviews with clergy in Indianapolis and Milwaukee show that ministers who work in low-income neighborhoods are also more likely to come face to face with people who are suffering from problems associated with low incomes, poor neighborhood conditions, and crime. Many people in low-income neighborhoods go to churches for material assistance, counseling, or prayer in times of crisis. As one Indianapolis pastor said, "I articulate a vision, one that does not get heard, one that I hear from the people who come to the church for help" (personal interview, 18 March 1993).

Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) argue that awareness of problems by itself may not be enough to stimulate political mobilization. Something must lead clergy to see that they have a personal *stake* in addressing problems associated with poverty, neighborhood development, and crime before they will become involved in activities designed to address these problems. One possible personal motivation would be a pastor's stake in the success of his or her congregation. On a material plane, the success of the congregation (in terms of attendance and therefore benevolence) may affect a minister's salary, status in the profession, likelihood of future promotion, and ability to hire staff to reduce the administrative workload. On a less tangible level, congregational success can affect a pastor's job satisfaction and self-esteem. For some clergy, the success of the congregation may even be tied to their views of obedience and responsiveness to God's calling.

In explaining why they were active in the community, several Indianapolis clergy indicated that they saw the livelihood of their neighborhoods as inextricably bound with the survival of their churches. As one minister stated, "We realized that if you don't have a community, you can't have a church" (personal interview, 27 May 1993). Through such statements these clergy show that they felt a clear personal stake in the social problems of their neighborhood. Even a "less aware" pastor, however, would be likely to recognize the damage that neighborhood crime and deterioration could do to the church's property values and attendance. Clergy in both Indianapolis and Milwaukee also explained that they felt it was important to address neighborhood problems in order to attract and keep new members in congregations in low-income neighborhoods.

The Indianapolis survey data do not include a measure of whether respondents felt they had a personal stake in addressing social problems. Consequently, we cannot use them to test whether feeling a personal stake explains the relationship between neighborhood context and rates of participation. Instead, the personal stake hypothesis serves as our default hypothesis. If the relationship between the low-income neighborhood index and the rate of clergy participation remains after controlling for other possible mobilization mechanisms and self-selection, we conclude that at least part of the relationship is due to a sense of personal stake in the social problems of the neighborhood.

The Membership Hypothesis

The more opportunities citizens have to participate in politics, and the more resources they have at their disposal, the less they will need to depend on others to give them a political voice. Citizens who live in relative affluence will not need (and perhaps will not want) their clergy to become involved in politics on their behalf. Residents of low-income neighborhoods, on the other hand, are less likely to have access to a wide variety of avenues to political participation. If we assume that congregations in low-income areas are more likely to have low-income members, we should expect that members of low-income neighborhood congregations would be more likely to support (or even to encourage) their clergy to participate in politics.

Indianapolis clergy estimate that only 33 percent of their congregation members live in the neighborhood immediately surrounding the congregation, so it is dangerous to assume that membership demographics mirror neighborhood demographics. But interviews with clergy show that people of relatively high socioeconomic status who attend congregations in low-income neighborhoods may encourage or support ministers to be politically active *even though* they personally have the resources to become involved on their own. Such members may also be advocates of urban renewal, or they may live in the suburbs but still maintain strong ties to "the old neighborhood." One Indianapolis minister explained that although a significant percentage of his congregational members did not live in the church's neighborhood, they still felt connected to it because they had grown up there; some also had relatives living there. Such individuals may want to see action taken to strengthen and preserve the neighborhood, but they may not be willing or able to do the work themselves. Instead they might turn to their clergy to take action.

Do clergy who serve churches or synagogues in low-income neighborhoods feel additional membership pressure to engage in politics? The data from Indianapolis show that they do not. The relationship between the neighborhood income measure and a measure of member pressure for clergy action is weak at best.[6] Direct membership encouragement does not appear to be a mobilizing mechanism that would be more relevant for clergy who serve in low-income neighborhoods. Therefore there is no reason to test for direct

membership pressure as a mobilizing mechanism that explains higher rates of participation among these clergy.

Although members may not encourage them directly to participate, clergy in low-income neighborhoods may feel an *indirect* pressure to engage in political activity for the sake of members. This may sound counterintuitive in light of research on Protestant clergy showing that membership pressure depresses clergy activity (Findlay 1993; Quinley 1974; Wood 1981). But the Indianapolis data show that it is only membership pressure *from longtime members* that tends to dampen clergy activism (Crawford 1995). Clergy who pay more attention to the potential reactions of *new and potential members* are more likely to be involved in politics (Crawford 1995). In interviews, Indianapolis and Milwaukee clergy stressed the importance of being involved in the community in order to attract and to keep new members. In Milwaukee one pastor explained that people frequently join his church specifically because it is known for its commitment to working for social change: "They know that we take very strong justice stands on social issues" (personal interview, 11 July 1994).

To test for an indirect membership effect, we used a variable that indicates whether a minister considers the potential reactions of new and potential members when deciding whether to engage in activities other than religious education and worship. Adding this variable to the model weakens the relationship between low-income neighborhood context and clergy participation a bit. This means that indirect pressure from new and potential members explains a part of the relationship that we find between low-income neighborhood context and higher rates of clergy activism.

The Leadership Vacuum Hypothesis

Regardless of whether members encourage their clergy to engage in political activity, and perhaps in spite of membership pressure against activism, urban pastors may feel an obligation to engage in community activism. Clergy who serve congregations in low-income areas may find that the neighborhoods where their churches are located have few other professionals available to assume leadership positions. Therefore they might come to see themselves as one of only a tiny handful of local people who are able to lead political or

nonprofit efforts successfully. This "leadership vacuum" mechanism may mobilize clergy in low-income neighborhoods to participate in community activities. These clergy may become politically active because there are relatively few others around to assume leadership positions. In the words of one Indianapolis pastor, "You always feel like you are in the position of having to speak for the people. . . . I [have] felt like I was the only voice that they had" (personal interview, 16 February 1993).

To test the leadership vacuum hypothesis, we add a variable that reflects the percentage of professionals present in a church's neighborhood to our statistical model.[7] When we add the neighborhood *professional* variable to the model, the relationship between neighborhood *income* and clergy activism vanishes, which indicates that the leadership vacuum is a dominant mechanism through which clergy serving in low-income areas become more active in local policy. The relationship between the rate of political activity and the percentage of professionals in the congregational neighborhood is very strong and statistically significant in this new model.[8] This means that the more professionals present in the neighborhood, the lower the rate of local clergy activity. When other professionals are around to undertake necessary political activity, clergy need not trouble themselves with it. Clearly the absence of other professionals appears to drive clergy who serve in low-income neighborhoods to participate in politics. Although there is a correlation between the low-income neighborhood index and the level-of-professionals index, it is not high enough to warrant disregarding these results.[9]

The Government Attention Hypothesis

Rosenstone and Hansen argue that "[W]hen applied to the question of which people participate in politics, the individual explanations of political activism . . . seem to satisfy. But when applied to the question of when people participate in politics, their inadequacies begin to show" (1993, 20). The "when" question would appear to be most significant for direct organizational mobilization. This leads us to consider specific examples of direct organizational mobilization that may have been occurring in Indianapolis at the time of the survey. Mayor Stephen Goldsmith, who was in his second year in office, had campaigned on a platform of strengthening neighborhoods. His administration had several initiatives in place that attempted to mobilize political

TABLE 7.2. *Test of the Government Attention Hypothesis*

	Incident Rate Ratio	Standard Error
Low-income neighborhood index	0.67***	0.087
Percentage of residents with professional occupations	0.76***	0.077
Level of government attention	1.93***	0.361
Clergy considering the reactions of new and potential members	1.24*	0.157
Clergy being called or placed with expectation of involvement	1.47***	0.167
Number of clergy's organizational ties	1.12***	0.040
Clergy having other employment in addition to clergy position(s)	0.48***	0.010
Clergy serving two or more congregations	1.45**	0.264
Clergy considering denominational leaders' reactions when making choices about activities	1.08	0.134
Model chi-square (9)	89.12***	

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1993 surveys in Indianapolis. $N = 180$.

NOTE: $^{*}p < 0.10$; $^{**}p < 0.05$; $^{***}p < 0.01$. The table lists the results of a Poisson regression in terms of incident rate ratios. The incident rate ratio is the rate at which the dependent variable increases as the independent variable increases. Values close to 1 indicate very little change. Values over 1 indicate a positive relationship. Values below 1 indicate a negative relationship.

activity, particularly in central-city neighborhoods (Crawford et al. 1994). These initiatives included trying to get nongovernmental organizations to address problems of poverty; trying to foster activity to improve neighborhoods; and trying, but not succeeding, to implement community policing. The mayor was quite explicit about his desire to see churches and clergy get involved in addressing neighborhood issues, and he put his money where his mouth was by supporting small financial grants for church-sponsored programs (see Goldsmith 1994). Goldsmith's mobilization activity may help explain why clergy who serve low-income neighborhoods were more active in Indianapolis in 1993, which would be consistent with our government attention hypothesis.

Since several of Goldsmith's initiatives had clearly marked jurisdictions, we can develop a five-point index that ranks neighborhoods in terms of the level of attention they received in the areas of neighborhood development, crime prevention, and low-income assistance. We use this index to test the government attention hypothesis. Table 7.2 shows results for our full model once we consider all of the hypothesized mobilizing mechanisms discussed above. These results indicate that once we consider the level of government attention directed toward mobilizing activity, the relationship between low-income neighborhood context and clergy activity becomes negative instead of posi-

tive. This means that adding the advantage of government attention to our model allows the disadvantages of working in a low-income neighborhood to surface. The membership mechanism and the leadership vacuum mechanism still appear to encourage clergy to take political action, however.

The results regarding government attention presented in table 7.2 appear convincing, but they must be treated with caution. The correlation between the low-income neighborhood index and the government attention index is very high, which raises concerns about the model's ability to separate and sort out the effects of a *low-income* context as opposed to the effects of a *high government attention* context.

In 1993 the government of Indianapolis was directing attention specifically to poverty-stricken neighborhoods, so the government attention results may be suspect. But we also find clergy who serve low-income areas to be more politically active in Milwaukee (Olson 1997, 2000), which strongly suggests that the relationship between neighborhood income and greater levels of clergy activism is not just an artifact of Mayor Goldsmith's specific initiatives. If we assume that our model is accurate in sorting the effects of the variables—and there is some evidence that it is (Crawford 1995)—then the results mean that government attention is a very powerful mechanism that leads to higher levels of political activity among clergy. Further, it shows that absent government attention, serving a low-income neighborhood may actually *demobilize* clergy rather than mobilizing them. The fact that attention to new members and the leadership vacuum remain significant variables in the model may also mean that the higher rates of activity among Indianapolis clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods is not explained by the Goldsmith administration policies alone. Although government attention might heighten the relevance of the leadership vacuum, there is good reason to expect the leadership vacuum to mobilize clergy in low-income neighborhoods even in the absence of significant government attention.

Conditions in low-income neighborhoods differ from those in areas that are more economically stable, and the low-income context appears to mobilize clergy, at least in local politics. Our results show that the existence of a leadership vacuum and government attention appear to be particularly effective mechanisms in the mobilization of urban clergy who work in low-income neighborhoods. Self-selection and attention to new and potential members

also help to explain the higher rate of activity among these clergy. There is little support, in the end, for an independent personal stake mobilizing mechanism. Once we control for other mobilizing mechanisms, serving in a low-income neighborhood no longer displays the predicted positive effect on the rate of clergy participation by itself.

Two larger lessons concerning clergy mobilization come from this analysis. First, the area in which a minister or rabbi works matters. Some of the mobilization pressures that clergy encounter appear to be most effective on clergy who serve in low-income neighborhoods. Moreover, indirect mobilization mechanisms such as the leadership vacuum can be quite powerful.

Clergy do "stand in the gap" in some urban neighborhoods. They step up to take on the challenges of civic participation in areas where many others are either unable or unwilling to become involved. And the evidence from Indianapolis illustrates that government attention does not drown out clergy activity. A mayor who encourages clergy involvement may well find a core of clergy ready for political action. As politicians devote more attention—and funds—to the potential of "faith-based institutions" to help ameliorate social problems, there are sure to be activist clergy ready and able to respond.

8 American Church or Church in America? The Politics of Catholic Bishops in Comparative Perspective

TIMOTHY A. BYRNES

The degree of initiative and independence exercised by American Catholic clergy is limited by their membership in a transnational institutional hierarchy headed in Rome by Pope John Paul II. The American bishops, the group of Catholic clergy who are the subject of this chapter, actively participate in the debates and processes of American politics. But they do so under clear guidelines and limitations set by the pope and the Vatican's curia. The bishops are, to be sure, leaders of an *American* church. But in contrast to the leaders of many other Christian denominations, they are also leaders of a universal church *in America.*

The American bishops' political role is not simply *directed* from Rome, however. Instead, the Catholic bishops' role in American politics is a function of a dynamic set of intersections between the constraints of transnational Catholicism on the one hand and the specific character of the American political process on the other. The moral teachings of the Church, for example, are developed within a Catholic authority structure that stretches well beyond the United States. But once those teachings are brought to the American political context by the American bishops, they are afforded political meaning not only by the content of the teaching itself, but also by the ways in which the specific teaching relates to the particular political divisions of the day.

I have decided to illustrate this dynamic in this chapter by comparing the role of the Catholic bishops in American politics with the role of their Polish counterparts in Polish politics. Comparative analysis of the American and Polish bishops will highlight the *institutional context* in which Catholic bishops operate. The very fact that the American bishops and the Polish bishops have to accommodate themselves to the same authority structure clearly indicates the omnipresence of that structure itself. The political choices of *all* bishops are constrained by the centralized authority of the Catholic Church.

At the same time, however, comparing the roles of the American and Pol-

ish hierarchies will also highlight the various *national contexts* that powerfully affect Catholic leaders' political choices. The American bishops and the Polish bishops play very different roles in their respective political processes despite the fact that they are all Catholic bishops and therefore act from a shared institutional base and with a shared set of moral and social teachings. A key explanation for this variation in role is that the national historical and political contexts within which those teachings are applied could scarcely be more different in the two countries. American bishops lead what is traditionally a minority church in a well-established democratic polity with clearly defined political alignments. Polish bishops, on the other hand, lead a traditionally dominant church in an emerging democracy wherein political alignments and partisan divisions are rapidly, and at times almost chaotically, evolving.

In short, American bishops are *Catholic* bishops *in America,* while Polish bishops are *Catholic* bishops *in Poland.* My argument is that these identifications are not merely statements of the obvious. Instead, they are necessary acknowledgements of the degree to which the choices of Catholic bishops, in America and elsewhere, are framed by both a transnational institutional context and a national political context. The institutional context, of course, is basically constant across different national settings, if not necessarily across time. But national contexts vary tremendously depending on the demographic, historical, and political attributes of a specific country. In this chapter I define the institutional context in which all Catholic bishops live and explore the ways in which shared transnational constraints can lead to widely varying political choices when applied to bishops who live and work in widely varying national settings.

Institutional Context

The Authority Structure of the Catholic Church

It is essential to know that the American bishops are embedded in a highly complex institutional structure wherein substantial, and at times even preeminent, authority over them and their Church is exercised from outside of the United States. One of the characteristic features of Roman Catholicism, after all, is its centralized hierarchy founded on the notion of papal primacy. The pope, the Church's supreme pontiff, plays a leading role in establishing

the moral and theological teachings of the Catholic Church, and he oversees a centralized bureaucracy dedicated to ensuring that his teachings are followed throughout the world (Reese 1996).

The apotheosis of papal authority, of course, stems from a declaration by the First Vatican Council (1869–70) that when the pope "defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the whole church," he does so infallibly; "such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not by the consent of the church, irreformable" (Tanner 1990, 2, 816). To be sure, not even the most ardent defender of papal authority argues that all of the pope's statements are infallible, or that all of his teachings are irreformable. In fact, the 130 years since Vatican I have seen a very lively debate within the Church over the extent to which the pope is ostensibly immune to error. But for my purposes, the declaration is itself instructive. An institution that defines its leadership as *infallible,* regardless of how circumscribed that declaration might be, is, to state the obvious, anxious to emphasize its centralized structure.[1]

A century after the declaration of infallibility, however, the Second Vatican Council (1962–65) sought to redress the balance of authority somewhat by placing greater emphasis on the legal status and teaching authority of Catholic *bishops.* Bishops, the council stated in its *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church,* "undertake Christ's own role as Teacher, Shepherd, and High Priest, and . . . they act in His person" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 42). Upon closer inspection, however, it turns out that the authority of Catholic bishops, separate and apart from the pope, can be exercised in an authentic fashion only when that authority is expressed in "communion" with the pope as supreme pontiff of the Church (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 43). What this means in practice is that the American bishops, either individually or collectively, cannot advance positions that are inconsistent with the pope's teachings. The American Catholic hierarchy does not contradict the pope on matters of faith and morals. If it did, it would automatically abdicate its authentic teaching authority as defined at Vatican II.[2]

Part of the rationale for papal primacy, of course, is closely related to the fact that the Church is so institutionally complex and so transnational in nature. There must be some central focal point of authority if such an institution is going to speak with one voice, or at least with relatively consistent voices in so many divergent historical, national, and political contexts. For this reason, any augmentation of the bishops' authority granted by the Second Vati-

can Council, was granted not to *a bishop* as an individual but rather to *the bishops* as members of the Church's transnational college of bishops.

According to Catholic teaching, this collective notion of authority is the very meaning of the term *collegiality.*[3] When the American bishops speak out on matters of faith or morals, they do so as members of the college of bishops, and it is only their membership in that college that gives them authority to speak authentically for the Church. For that reason, the position that American bishops might take on a public issue like abortion or nuclear weapons must be fundamentally consistent with the position taken on that issue by German bishops or Brazilian bishops or bishops from any other country. The American bishops do not have to say *exactly the same thing* as their German or Brazilian counterparts, because national context can call for variations in emphasis and tone. But no bishop can say anything that differs substantially from a platform that is essentially a single *magisterium,* or teaching authority. There is no *American* Catholic position on nuclear weaponry and no *German* Catholic position on nuclear weaponry. There is a *Catholic* position on nuclear weaponry that is expressed in somewhat different ways by American bishops and German bishops, all of whom derive their authority from their membership in the college of bishops in communion with and headed by the pope.

"*Some Problems of Special Urgency*"

The central authority of the Catholic Church does not serve merely as an arbiter of Catholic teaching, however. In many ways, it also serves as its fundamental and voluminous source. For example, papal encyclicals have been an important tool through which popes have set both the basic framework and the specific contours of the Church's teachings. In recent years papal visits, with their attendant spectacle and symbolic power, have also served as important instruments of the pope's coordination and control of his very disparate flock. In terms of both general guidelines and specific substance, however, nothing has had a more direct influence on the American bishops and their political choices than the Second Vatican Council's *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.*[4]

This seminal document called on bishops and other Catholic leaders throughout the world to "scrutiniz[e] the signs of the times and . . . interpret them in the light of the Gospel," and to engage with "the whole of humanity"

in a "conversation" about "various problems" facing contemporary society (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 200–1). This was, among many other things, a specific authorization for the American bishops to rethink their approach to modern society and its problems. Prior to Vatican II, popes and Church spokesmen had discouraged American prelates from becoming involved in respectful dialogue with non-Catholic segments of society concerning the political and social problems of the day. After the *Pastoral Constitution,* however, the American bishops were asked not only to engage in such a dialogue but to consider that dialogue a central feature of their pastoral mission. "The joys and hopes," the *Constitution* declared, "the griefs and anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 199–200).

In addition to redirecting the American bishops' general approach to modern society, the *Pastoral Constitution* was also quite specific concerning the positions that the bishops should take on these political and social questions. In fact, in a section entitled "Some Problems of Special Urgency," the *Pastoral Constitution* laid out an account of Catholic teaching's relationship with modern society that has served as a remarkably clear blueprint for the actions and positions taken by the American hierarchy ever since.

The three issue areas that the American bishops have dealt with most directly since Vatican II have been peace and war, economic relations, and abortion. In all three areas, the American bishops' specific positions have closely mirrored those of the *Pastoral Constitution.* For example, the bishops' 1983 pastoral letter on nuclear weapons denounced the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union by declaring: "under no circumstances may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass slaughter be used for the purpose of destroying population centers or other predominantly military targets" (Ellis 1987, 823). This position may have been a bit less surprising in 1983 (if no less controversial) had more of the bishops' readers been aware that the Vatican Council, in the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World,* had declared two decades earlier that nuclear weapons required "an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude," and that "[a]ny act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their populations is a crime against God and man himself" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 294).

Similarly, in 1986 the American bishops wrote in another pastoral letter entitled *Economic Justice for All* that any economic system, specifically including liberal capitalism, should be judged by "what it does for and to people, and by how it permits all to participate in it" (Ellis 1987, 983). Some American Catholics strongly objected to the criticism of American capitalism that was quite directly implied in this statement (Lay Commission 1984). But the bishops could, and did, cite for support the *Pastoral Constitution*'s dismissal of unfettered free enterprise as "a false liberty," and its depiction of the supposed societal benefits of "the economic activity of individuals" as the unfulfilled promises of "erroneous" theories (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 273–74).

The *Pastoral Constitution* set forth a general framework for the American hierarchy's positions on economic justice and war and peace. But when it came to abortion, the *Pastoral Constitution* not only established the framework, it set the specific position. The Second Vatican Council, for all practical purposes, issued a political directive to all Catholic bishops when it declared that "from the moment of conception life must be guarded with the greatest of care" and when it denounced all abortions as "unspeakable crimes" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 255–56). For Catholic bishops, abortion is not an issue on which split-the-difference political compromises can be struck. In a very powerful sense, the American bishops are not free to do anything *but* oppose abortion because they are framed by a specific institutional context. Their very authority as bishops is derived from their membership in a collegial, collective body that has denounced abortion in absolute terms. They can give the issue more or less emphasis, but their position *must* be that abortion, as such, is "an unspeakable crime."

In short, for this group of American clergy, political choices are powerfully constrained by institutional interests, theological teachings, and political dispositions over which they have only limited control. To be sure, the American hierarchy does retain substantial initiative in applying Catholic teaching to the specific signs of the times that *they* read in the United States; that was the point of the pastoral letters of the 1980s. Nevertheless, the American bishops are still *Catholic* bishops, part of a much broader institutional structure. In many important ways, they are still subject to a degree of external authority and direction that would be unthinkable for most of the other religious leaders under discussion in this volume.

This institutional context is only one factor that shapes the political roles

and choices of the American Catholic hierarchy. To repeat, the American bishops are not only Catholic bishops; they are Catholic bishops *in America.* They and their political activities are also powerfully influenced by the particular national context in which they live.

National Context

Immigrant Church or Church of the Nation

One of the most important aspects of national context, in terms of shaping the role of the Catholic hierarchy, is the religious composition and religious traditions of a nation's people. All Catholic bishops come to their particular political setting bearing the teachings of the Church and operating under the institutional constraints of a transnational authority structure. But the place that those bishops can expect to hold in society, and the ways in which their actions are likely to be interpreted politically, will be affected by demographic, historical, and cultural factors that are characteristic of the nation in which they live and work.

Throughout most of American history, the Catholic Church's fundamental challenge was defending the right of immigrant American Catholics to participate fully in American democracy in the face of charges that the Church's hyphenated membership, antidemocratic structure, and devotion to the "Pope of Rome" rendered it suspiciously foreign and presumptively un-American. In rather sharp contrast, the fundamental challenge facing the Polish Catholic hierarchy today is defending the right of Poland's largest church to play a leading role in defining national culture and setting political priorities in a post-Communist democracy. Not so surprisingly, these varying contexts make for sharply varying roles for these two sets of Catholic bishops.

The history of immigrant Catholicism in the United States is long and complex, and there has been great diversity among American Catholic leaders. Nevertheless, American Catholic political strategies have taken three basic forms. First, American bishops asserted their conviction, loudly and often, that all charges of dual loyalty were simply untrue and therefore fundamentally insulting. "We owe no religious allegiance to any state in this union, nor to its central government," the bishops said in a representative statement from 1837. "Nor do we acknowledge any civil or political supremacy or power over

us in any foreign potentate, though that potentate might be the chief pastor of our church" (Nolan 1984, 1, 90).

The second strategy moved past mere assertion of loyalty to demonstration of it through a remarkably uncritical acceptance of American foreign policy and American military action. Dorothy Dohen (1967) has written of the Catholic hierarchy's "superpatriotism" through the long immigrant era. During this period, bishop after bishop sought to demonstrate, through his own support of American aims, that American Catholics, hyphenated or not, could be counted upon not only to serve loyally in the American military but also to defend, aggressively and even vociferously, American national security and American national interests. This boosterism took several forms over the years, from John Carroll's principled defense of the American Revolution, to southern bishops' regrettable support of the Confederacy, to Francis Cardinal Spellman's thoughtless caricature of patriotism during the Vietnam War. American bishops today would be unlikely to utter statements like Spellman's declaration that he "fully support[ed] everything [his country] does" (Dohen 1967, 1). But today's bishops do not have to defend the patriotic credentials of their people, nor do they have to explain away the Church's views on the constitutional separation of church and state.

One of the central reasons why today's bishops have less to explain is that their predecessors were so successful in pressing their third defensive strategy. American bishops were not afraid to argue to the Vatican and other national hierarchies that the American constitutional order was advantageous to the Church's interests in the United States, and that the export of constitutionalism to other national settings might be a desirable development as well. Intimations of this latter claim led to the so-called Americanist crisis at the turn of the century, which featured tense relations between the popes and American bishops (Cross 1958; McAvoy 1957). In time, however, the distinctively American claim that a formal separation of church and state might actually expand the potential scope of the Church's influence by carving out an autonomous space where it could carry out its mission found favor within the universal Catholic Church. Vatican II's *Declaration on Religious Liberty,* which is often called the "American declaration" because of the central role American churchmen played in drafting it, revolutionized Catholic doctrine by holding that "[the] right of the human person to religious freedom is to be

recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 679; see also Fogarty 1982, 368–99; Murray 1960).

Since the writing of the *Declaration on Religious Liberty* and the assimilation of American Catholics into the mainstream of American society, the American Catholic hierarchy has taken on a much less defensive tone. To be sure, there are still times when American bishops must explain why their calls for state-supported parochial schools, or even for restrictive anti-abortion legislation, are not calls for the kind of preferential legal treatment that traditional Catholic teaching demanded and that the U.S. Constitution rejects. But on the whole, the Catholic hierarchy today is quite secure in its place in America and relatively unconcerned about occasional charges that it poses a threat to proper relations between church and state. It is in this context that today's American bishops pursue their political agenda. Part of the reason for their security is that the bishops, and their predecessors, have consistently expressed their acceptance of, and support for, the distinctive American constitutional definitions of religious freedom and disestablishment. Under very different circumstances, however, and in a very different national context, the leaders of the Catholic Church in Poland are having considerably more difficulty in accepting the constitutional limitations on the Church's status that have accompanied the rebirth of Polish democracy.

The central social and political status of the Catholic Church in Poland is a function of two related factors. A high percentage of Poles are members of the Church, and the Church has a longstanding identification with the Polish nation during Poland's long and tragic history of invasion, partition, and foreign domination (see Szajkowski 1983). The Polish *state* actually disappeared from the map of Europe from 1795 to 1918, but the Polish *nation,* the collective sense of identity among the Polish people, endured. It was able to do so in part because of the nationalist energy and institutional viability provided by the Catholic Church. This bond between Church and nation grew even stronger during the brutal occupation of World War II and was in a sense sealed by the genocide and forced migrations that turned multiethnic, multiconfessional Poland into a virtually homogenous Catholic nation. Finally, during the Communist era, the Church developed into an indispensable locus of opposition to a regime that was never really accorded national legitimacy by the mass of the Polish population (Osa 1989).

The fact that the Polish nation came to rely on the Church to provide free

space in a decidedly unfree context, however, does not mean that Poles necessarily want the Church to play a leading role in society now that national self-determination and political freedom have actually been achieved.[5] Moreover, as Morawska (1995) has pointed out, the fact that Polish Church leaders found Communism utterly abhorrent and irreconcilable with the Polish national traditions is by no means a guarantee that those leaders will find liberal democracy, pluralism, and the development of a secular state any more congenial.

It is not really appropriate, of course, to discuss "the Church" or the "leaders of the Church" as though these were monolithic entities. Any institution as large as the Polish Catholic Church is bound to house differing factions and emphases. Despite this necessary caveat, however, it is nevertheless the case that the Polish hierarchy, as a collectivity, has sought in democratic Poland to carve out a privileged social, political, and legal status for their Church (see Ramet 1998, 285–307). Polish bishops have insisted that Poland is, and must remain, an identifiably Catholic nation wherein the Catholic Church must enjoy a prominent and institutionalized public role. The Church, they argue, should therefore have access to public school classrooms. It should play a role in defining and promulgating popular culture. And it should continue to be recognized as the embodiment of Poland's legitimate national heritage. Having suffered for so long under foreign rule, the Polish bishops want Poland to assert, unapologetically and unambiguously, a national character that is closely associated with the Catholic faith.

This chapter is not the place for a detailed analysis of the bishops' political efforts to defend and advance this vision of a Catholic Poland, nor an accounting of the Polish bishops' political successes and failures since the fall of Communism. My main point is that the Catholic Church's central place in Polish history and its central role in defining the Polish nation have led the Polish Catholic hierarchy to adopt an assertive approach to contemporary Polish politics. At best, the hierarchy has an ambivalent attitude toward an effective separation of church and state in democratic Poland.

The leaders of the Catholic Church in Poland, like leaders of the Catholic Church in America, function under the constraints of universal Church teaching, including the *Declaration on Religious Liberty.* But just as the American bishops sought to find the space to fit the Church's teaching on church-state relations into their national context before 1965, so too the Polish bishops to-

day are struggling to reconcile the interests and teachings of their transnational Church with the traditions, relationships, and expectations created by their national context. For the Polish bishops, of course, this task is made ever more complicated by the fact that Pope John Paul II, the current leader of their transnational Church, is himself a Pole. For Polish bishops, John Paul is anything but a remote authority figure. He is in fact intimately involved in the process of applying Catholic teaching to the radically new national context in post-Communist Poland (Byrnes 1996; Paltrow 1986).

Demographics and tradition, however, are not the only national contextual factors that influence the role of the Catholic Church in any particular setting. Historical context sets the general parameters within which contemporary bishops behave. But the particular nature of the bishops' choices, and just as importantly the political meaning that those choices are likely to have at any given time, are powerfully influenced by the specific political context within which they take place. More exactly, they are influenced by the way in which the teachings of the transnational Church intersect with the policy agenda and partisan alignment of a particular political system.

Partisan Politics

Most stable political party systems exhibit fairly predictable partisan alignments that are defined by a central set of policy issues, often referred to as the primary cleavage. What this means is that some voters or categories of voters will, *on the basis of their positions on the issues associated with the primary cleavage,* tend to belong to one party or align themselves on one end of the political spectrum. At the same time other voters, on the basis of *their* position on issues associated with the primary cleavage, will belong to the other party or align themselves at the other end of the political spectrum (Sundquist 1983). For example, the partisan alignment that grew out of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal and his reformulation of the Democratic Party was based on a split among American voters along a primary cleavage over the proper role of the national government in the business cycle. To put it perhaps a bit too simply, those who were in favor of an active role for the national government in the economy aligned with the Democrats, while those opposed aligned with the Republicans.

Once an alignment is set, political competition ensues along two tracks. Parties and candidates contend with each other over the issues defined as the

primary cleavage. But parties and candidates also contend with each other over issues that do not fit comfortably into the central issue competition—issues that *cut across* the primary cleavage. Cross-cutting issues can be minor issues that have little effect on the main partisan competition. They can be fairly major questions that significantly blur the existing alignment. Or they can come to compete with or even obliterate the existing primary cleavage, leading to serious dislocation in the polity and what generations of political scientists have referred to as a *realignment* of the party system (see Bass 1991).

My argument here is that the nature of the relationship between the Catholic Church's moral agenda and the alignment of a given national party system will go a long way in determining both the general direction and the specific nature of the bishops' political activities within that system. If the bishops' agenda happens to run parallel to the primary cleavage (if it fits comfortably within the range of partisan competition), then the bishops themselves will be just as comfortably associated with one wing or another of the political alignment. If, on the other hand, the bishops' agenda cuts across the primary cleavage of a given party system (if the Church's key issues do not fit comfortably with the rhetoric and substance of partisan competition), then the bishops will play a complex, conflicted role in that political system. This latter scenario describes the Catholic hierarchy's role in contemporary American electoral politics.

Imagine an American political party that opposed legal abortion completely, supported sharp reductions in American defense spending and even sharper reductions in American nuclear weaponry, and assessed every economic question in American public life through a lens focused squarely on the needs of the poor. Imagine further that this party opposed the death penalty under almost all circumstances, but endorsed tuition tax credits to support parents who wish to send their children to parochial school. I am not sure what we would call such a party, but I am quite sure we could assume that it would enjoy fairly consistent support from most of the American Catholic bishops. Put another way, if the American party system were divided into one party or set of parties that shared the bishops' vision for the future and one that did not, then the partisan implications of the bishops' agenda would be clear, and probably unavoidable.

The fact is, however, that the relationship between the teachings of the Church and the partisan alignment of today's American politics is not nearly

so clear. In fact, over the last several decades (going back to the Supreme Court's 1973 decision in *Roe* v. *Wade*), the Catholic Church in America has operated within a national political context wherein neither major party agrees with all of the items on the Church's diverse policy agenda. Since the late 1970s, for example, large and even controlling elements within the Republican Party have shared the bishops' opposition to abortion and supported the bishops' advocacy of tax credits to offset the costs of parochial school tuition. At the same time, however, many Democratic candidates who diverge sharply from the Church's teaching on abortion have joined the bishops' call for just and humane social welfare policies, and for less aggressive and less expensive foreign and defense policies. Because the Church's moral agenda, as laid out in places like the Second Vatican Council's *Pastoral Constitution,* cuts across the alignments and divisions of partisan politics in the United States, the leaders of the Catholic Church in America have been faced with some very difficult political choices.

Who should the Catholic hierarchy have supported in the 1984 presidential election, for example? Should it have endorsed Ronald Reagan, a candidate who had denounced abortion and who supported a constitutional amendment recriminalizing it? Or should it have preferred Walter Mondale, a candidate who supported legal abortion and named a pro-choice Catholic woman (Geraldine Ferraro) as his running mate? If the only issue at stake in 1984 had been abortion, then the partisan implications of the Church's teaching would have been obvious to all. But what are we to make of the fact that the bishops' pastoral letter on nuclear weapons had been written, in large part, as a reaction against Reagan's nuclear buildup and to his musings about winning a nuclear war? What about the fact that in 1984 the bishops were beginning work on another pastoral letter that would take issue, on fundamental moral grounds, with virtually every economic policy that Ronald Reagan and his Republican Party stood for at the time? When we take a broader look at the full scope of the Church's politically relevant and politically charged positions, the partisan implications are anything but clear. Reagan's opposition to abortion could no more be separated in actual political fact from his positions on these other issues than Mondale's support for a nuclear freeze could be separated from his clear and vocal support for a woman's right to terminate an unwanted pregnancy.

As a matter of official, collective policy, the response of the National Con-

ference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) to the Church's incompatibility with current partisan politics in the United States has been to refrain from endorsing individual candidates. (Such a path could threaten the Church's tax exemption anyway.) Instead the NCCB focuses on outlining the Church's teachings on key issues and explaining how Catholic teachings can be applied to particular policy matters. Before every presidential election, the NCCB releases what the bishops call their Political Responsibility Statement, in which they list their formal political positions and encourage American Catholics to keep these positions in mind when they vote for the candidates of their choice.

Some leading members of the NCCB, most notably Chicago's late archbishop, Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, have argued that the American Catholic hierarchy should go further by explicitly knitting its diverse moral teachings into a "seamless garment" of respect for human life. More concretely, this approach, also referred to by Bernardin and others as the "consistent ethic" of life, requires the Church's opposition to abortion to be tied closely to the Church's support for the poor and its condemnation of nuclear strategies that target innocent civilians (Byrnes 1991, 114–15). This consistent ethic offers no reliable guidance on how to choose among candidates and parties that do not share the Church's views across the full range of moral issues. But this was exactly its attraction for Church leaders like Bernardin who were trying in the 1980s to prevent the Church and its teachings from being distorted and used for partisan advantage.

The incompatibility between the consistent ethic and American partisan politics led other prominent Catholic prelates to distance themselves publicly from Bernardin and his ideas. Such visible Catholic leaders as Bernard Cardinal Law, archbishop of Boston, and John Cardinal O'Connor, late archbishop of New York, argued instead that abortion was the critical issue of the day. For them, the fact that the Church's agenda did not completely fit the agenda of one party or another was no reason to refrain from pointing out that the Republican Party was willing to move toward the recriminalization of abortion while the Democratic Party was not (Byrnes 1991, 116–26).

The NCCB's quadrennial Political Responsibility Statements might influence the moral reasoning, and by extension the political calculations, of those who read them or hear about them from a Catholic pulpit. In the same way, Cardinal Bernardin's consistent ethic might lead some Catholics to assess political choices from a wide-ranging moral framework. Catholics who embrace

the view championed by Cardinal Law and Cardinal O'Connor might be convinced that abortion is the issue of prime importance today and that it should therefore be central to an authentically Catholic politics. But from an analytical point of view, it is most important to realize that the political role of the American Catholic bishops is circumscribed by the fact that their views do not fit within either partisan camp in American electoral politics. Indeed, I would argue that this fundamental lack of fit is itself the most important contextual factor shaping the role of the Catholic bishops in the United States today. The bishops are, at least in a collective sense, barred by the breadth and content of their agenda from the kind of close, organic relationships we have observed in recent years between other groups of clergy and one wing or another of the ideological spectrum.

Such has not always been the case, of course. At other times, under the sway of other political alignments, the Catholic bishops have been positioned as clear and prominent supporters of one side of the partisan competition. Franklin Roosevelt's political program of expanding social welfare at home and aggressively defending American interests abroad was quite comfortably consistent with the moral and social commitments of the Catholic hierarchy at that time. Roosevelt, in fact, quoted papal encyclicals in support of the New Deal, explicitly sought the help of American cardinals and bishops in appealing to Catholic voters, and relied on the Catholic Church for institutional support of his internationalist foreign policy. The role played by the Catholic hierarchy varies along with the relationship between the Church's politically relevant teachings and the policy agenda and partisan competition of a particular national setting. We can see that variance across time within one national setting. But we can see it even more clearly when we compare one national setting to another.

The leaders of the Catholic Church in democratic Poland are not operating in a political context dominated by the kind of stable two-party competition that exists in the United States. Instead, since 1989 the Polish bishops have found themselves in a political maelstrom characterized by a large number of rather fragmented political parties competing for voters who are just emerging from decades of totalitarian rule. This wholly understandable instability has posed difficult challenges for all political actors in Poland, including the Catholic Church. One of the reasons, in fact, that the Catholic Church's po-

litical role in Poland is uncertain at the moment is precisely because the partisan alignment of Polish politics is itself so uncertain (Morawska 1995, 48).

But it was not always this way. In 1989 the primary cleavage of Polish politics could not have been clearer. The so-called Roundtable election of that year was fought over the question of whether Communism should continue as Poland's official and dominant ideology. The Communist Party and its suddenly beleaguered supporters ended up on one side of the resulting alignment. On the other side was the Solidarity movement and its enthusiastic supporter, the Catholic Church. One close observer of the Roundtable election identified eighteen separate ways that the Church helped Solidarity defeat the Communists in 1989. The Church did things as varied as offering moral and religious sanction to Solidarity leaders, to hosting innumerable Solidarity rallies, to praying publicly for a Solidarity victory in the days leading up to the vote (Kosela 1990). This election was, after all, *the* fundamental test of Poland's will to resist Communism and recapture political freedom and cultural autonomy. And there was never any doubt about the side of that divide on which the Catholic Church chose to stand.

Once these goals were met, however, through the collapse of the Communist Party and the institution of Polish democracy, the political alignment became more muddled, and the choices facing the Catholic bishops became more complicated. It was one thing for the Polish bishops to support a unified Solidarity in opposition to Communism. But what were the bishops to do when Solidarity split into a wide array of separate political parties that set out in the early 1990s to do battle not with Communism but with each other? What role should the Church play in a political system that could, and did, produce twenty-seven separate parties in the Sejm (lower house) of Parliament and fully thirteen separate parties in a coalition government?

What Poland experienced during this period was a kind of explosion of repressed political energy. Forced to forgo meaningful political organization for fifty years, the Polish electorate split dramatically into many small fragmented parties. Moreover, this political dynamic was exacerbated by the structural effects of a strict system of proportional representation in which a party receiving as little as one percent of the national vote would receive seats in the Sejm. These phenomena posed very real threats to the development of stable party competition in Poland. That is why, before the 1993 parliamentary elec-

tion, a revised electoral law instituted thresholds of 5 percent for individual parties and 8 percent for coalitions. But the momentum toward fragmentation nevertheless obscured the clarity of the cleavage of 1989 and correspondingly obscured the clarity of the Catholic Church's relationship to the political alignment.

Morawska (1995) assessed a number of different political scenarios and how they would be likely to affect the role of the bishops in Polish politics. She also examined how the bishops' political positions and activities would be received by the mass of the Polish people. Morawska was writing at a time when Poland was governed by the bishops' political enemies on the reconstituted left, and she hoped to identify the consequences for the bishops if this government either solidified its position or was replaced by a center-right government (Morawska 1995, 68–71). As a matter of fact, the left did lose the 1997 parliamentary elections, and Poland is now governed by a coalition of the Solidarity Electoral Alliance and the Freedom Union, a grouping that is much more amenable to many of the bishops' interests and policy positions. As a result, the Church's leadership occupies a less defensive position today than in any other time since 1993. Today powerful members of Poland's governing coalition share the Church's positions on issues like abortion, popular culture, and the "Christian heritage" of the Polish nation.

In terms of my argument here, however, the crucial point is not whether the bishops support or oppose one government or another. The aspect of the political context I am most interested in is the *relationship* between the bishops' agenda and the agenda of Polish national politics. My argument implies that the future political role of the Polish Catholic hierarchy will be shaped most powerfully by the nature of the intersection between the Church's interests on the one hand, and the primary cleavage and partisan alignment of Polish electoral politics on the other.

So far, the underlying cleavage that brought about the revolution in Poland and throughout Communist Europe has endured quite well in Poland. The former Communists have regrouped into the Democratic Left Alliance and entered into partisan competition with the largest of the post-Solidarity parties. At least at this level of competition, the political role of the Catholic bishops has remained entirely clear: they oppose the former Communists.[6] But it is also true that the political fragmentation that has taken place within the old Solidarity camp, combined with the inevitable passage of time between the

Communist past and post-Communist present, has resulted in the creation of new political cleavages. As long as Polish politics is about either the Communist past or an identifiably Catholic future, then the role of the bishops will be straightforward, potentially quite important, and unavoidably partisan. But as Polish politics moves away from these questions and toward truly post-Communist cleavages and alignments, the specific nature of the intersection between those cleavages and Polish Catholic teaching and traditions will result in a reduced, or at least fundamentally different, political role for the leadership of the Catholic Church in Poland.

My discussion of Poland, of course, is intended to support my argument that the *American* bishops' political role is shaped by the intersection of the agenda and authority structure of the transnational Church within the particular political context of the United States. I began this chapter by emphasizing the extent to which the American bishops, and all bishops for that matter, are constrained by their membership in a transnational institutional hierarchy headed in Rome by Pope John Paul II. In pointing out these constraints, one needs to be careful not to overdramatize the "foreign" nature of the Catholic Church or to imply that transnational Catholicism poses some kind of a danger to American constitutionalism. It is certainly not my intention here to revive Blanshard's dark warnings against the "Catholic system of global discipline"(1958, 47).

Nevertheless, the American Catholic bishops are indeed part of a centralized authority structure that is headed outside of the United States and that is, to put it mildly, not dedicated to democratic principles and procedures in terms of its own institutional life. In comparison to many other American clergy, Catholic bishops are less free to set their own moral agenda, shade their own policy positions, and strike their own political compromises. But those institutional constraints are at best only half the story. At the same time that we emphasize the transnational institutional context set by the Church's hierarchical authority structure, we must also emphasize the powerful effect that national historical and political contexts have on the bishops and on their political activities. I have argued in particular that in the United States as in Poland, the bishops' political role is shaped by the specific relationship that pertains between the Church's universal moral teachings and the cleavages and alignments of a particular political moment.

For a quarter-century, a lack of comfortable fit in this regard has placed the American bishops and their agenda in the relatively unusual position of cutting across the primary moral cleavages of the day. Nothing, however, lasts forever in politics. The basic cleavage in the American party system between more or less activist Democrats and more or less laissez-faire Republicans has endured for an unusually long time. Politics in the United States today is still largely, though not exclusively, about taxing, spending, and governmental intervention in the economy. But other cleavages and substantially altered alignments are sure to arise in the future. Political reform and opposition to the corrupting effects of campaign financing could unite disaffected wings of both major parties. Social conservatives could give up on the Republican Party and launch a third-party disruption of the current alignment. A Social Security crisis could lead to age cohort replacing class as an organizing principle of political mobilization. A war or environmental crisis could fundamentally shift the way Americans think about politics and about each other.

None of us, of course, has a crystal ball. But whatever the future holds for the content and structure of the American political competition, that competition will intersect in some way with the moral teachings and political agenda of the Catholic Church. And it will be that point of intersection that will shape the political role of the transnational Catholic Church in the United States. The Church's moral teachings, policy agenda, and authority structure will not be uniquely American. But the relationship between these constants of transnational Catholicism, on the one hand, and the highly variable and highly specific characteristics of contemporary American politics, on the other, most certainly will be.

9 The Mobilization of a Religious Elite: Political Activism among Southern Baptist Clergy in 1996

JAMES L. GUTH

Reflecting their renewed interest in the political role of the clergy, social scientists have studied ministers in specific denominations (Hailey 1988; Luidens and Nemeth 1989), religious traditions (Langenbach and Green 1992; Shie 1991), regions or localities (Hayes 1995; Murphy 1993; Olson 1994), and commercial samples (Beatty and Walter 1989). Much has been learned about clergy's importance as cue-givers, community activists, and campaign workers (see Guth et al. 1997, 7–22, for an overview). Nevertheless, few studies have tried systematically to explain why some religious leaders participate in politics and others do not, which is the very quest that prompted the classic studies of clergy politics (see Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974).

There are several reasons for this failure. Many recent studies have been exploratory, based on small samples that are ideal for intensive qualitative work but problematic for quantitative analysis. Even when the sample is large enough to permit quantitative analysis, the battery of participation items is often small or restricted to one kind of involvement. As I noted in chapter 3, many studies concentrate primarily on clergy's professional activities, such as preaching on political issues or forming study groups in the church, while others focus on electoral involvement. Few surveys have extensive batteries of items about a broad range of participatory modes. Finally, even if the sample size is large and the range of participatory acts expansive, important explanatory variables may be missing from the data set, which precludes comprehensive analysis (see Guth et. al 1997, 181–84).

This chapter fills part of this gap through analysis of political participation among Southern Baptist ministers in 1996. Although Southern Baptists are certainly not representative of all Protestant clergy, there are two good reasons to focus on them. First, the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) is the largest Protestant denomination in the United States, with more than 15 million members (Ammerman 1990); its 80,000 ordained pastors greatly outnumber

Roman Catholic parish clergy or, for that matter, the combined ministerial corps of mainline Protestant churches. Long regarded as politically passive, Baptist ministers have recently become more interested in politics, increased their activism, and shifted massively toward the Republican Party and conservative causes (Guth 1996). Thus, SBC clergy are a large, active, and politically vital force in much of the United States, especially in vote-rich "sunbelt" states, so they warrant attention on substantive grounds.

Second, there is a wealth of data on these clergy. My colleagues and I have surveyed a random sample of SBC ministers after every presidential election from 1980 through 1996. Over this period I have continually added new questions on political activities suggested by respondents themselves, by events in the political world, and by other scholarly work on political participation. In the 1996 survey, I asked about twenty-four distinct acts, including voter registration drives, economic boycotts, distribution of voter guides, public prayers for candidates, and other activities that were either ignored by earlier scholars or had no relevance at the time they wrote. I also included new questions designed to measure political participation, such as political interest, political efficacy, organizational membership, political contacting, and media use. Thus a rich supply of data on the activity of Southern Baptist pastors is available to test theories about that involvement.[1]

My central question in this chapter is very simple: What factors explain clergy's choices about political participation? To answer this query, I first construct a measure of general political participation utilizing the twenty-four activity items from the 1996 survey. Then I review the relevant strands of political science theory on activism, drawn from the literatures on mass public involvement and ministerial politics. I report bivariate relationships for each strand of theory and check whether there is at least prima facie evidence for each perspective. Finally, I undertake a multivariate analysis of all the competing perspectives and draw some conclusions about the sources of political activity among Southern Baptist ministers.

A Measure of General Participation

The political participation measure is an additive index of twenty-four acts ranging from pulpit pronouncements to several kinds of campaigning. Although the actions fall into distinct participatory modes quite similar to those

reported in *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997, 163ff.), they also produce a highly reliable general index of participation with a range from 0 to 20, a mean of 6.85, and a standard deviation of 4.52.[2] About 7 percent of respondents report *no* political actions in 1996, while an equal percentage claim they took fourteen or more actions. Some ministers say they abstained totally from politics, while others were "complete activists." So there is plenty of variation to explain.

Explaining Political Participation

Scholarly analysis of political participation has traditionally focused on the mass public, with little attention to occupational groups, although Verba, Schlozman, and Brady have noted that professional groups may display "different configurations of participatory factors and levels of activity" (1995, 414). I take their hint by drawing on converging perspectives from the literatures on mass participation and on clerical politics. Together these perspectives offer four partially competing theories stressing four sources of activism: (1) *personal resources* of the potential activist, such as socioeconomic status and psychological engagement; (2) *professional ideology,* including theological perspectives and ministerial role orientations; (3) *issue mobilization,* especially ideological and partisan perspectives; and (4) *organizational activity.* As we shall see, a first cut at the data provides some support for each of the four views, but the final analysis reveals that a combination of professional role orientations, ideological factors, and organizational mobilization best explains clerical participation.

Personal Resources

Socioeconomic Status (SES). The classic works on mass political participation utilize the socioeconomic status (SES) model, which posits that political involvement is the product of high social class, wealth, and advanced education, all of which supply citizens with the resources for effective political action (Verba and Nie 1972, 148). In addition, most studies report that older citizens, who have more life experience, know more about politics, and are more settled in their communities, report higher activity levels (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993, 136–141). Urban residence sometimes seems to facilitate participation, but in other studies, rural life encourages activity (Verba and Nie 1972, 229–47).

Are ministers as affected by socioeconomic variables in the same way as other citizens? At first glance, ministers might seem socioeconomically homogeneous, as most are well-educated professionals with middle-class incomes. Indeed, most scholars have made this assumption (Quinley 1974), and some conclude that their relatively high socioeconomic status explains clergy's characteristic high rates of participation (Beatty and Walter 1989). Like many other clergy in the evangelical tradition, however, Southern Baptists come from almost every imaginable social class background but are primarily working class. Their educational backgrounds and incomes also vary. This variation in personal status is reflected in the congregations they serve: those with larger, middle-class congregations are not only wealthier but have additional resources (and perhaps incentives) at their disposal for political involvement (Sapp 1975, 164). In addition, as I pointed out in chapter 3, different *kinds* of educational experiences may result in varying political tendencies.

In another vein, age may have a different impact among clergy than it does in the mass public. Generally, older citizens tend to be more active. In the 1960s, however, Quinley (1974) found that younger clergy—not older ones—were most politically engaged. This may have been a result of their extensive education, a reaction to the political stimuli of the civil rights and Vietnam War era, or perhaps an embrace of new role expectations inculcated in seminaries. In recent years, similar forces have shaped young conservatives; today's Baptist ministers are increasingly well educated, grew up in the midst of protracted "culture wars" over abortion, gay rights, and sex education in the schools, and have witnessed the new politicization of conservative Protestantism firsthand.

Despite the marked socioeconomic differences among Baptist clergy, a quick review shows that the correlations between ministers' socioeconomic resources and their political involvement are very weak. Surprisingly, social class background, as measured by father's occupation, mother's occupation, and upward mobility, has virtually no relationship to participation. Age and length of time in the ministry are only mildly related to activism. Both younger clergy and those who are new to the profession are more active, as Quinley (1974) discovered in the late 1960s, but the correlations for this relationship are weak ($r = 0.16$). Neither a pastor's original or current community type has a strong relationship to activism, although the small coefficient for urban residence as a child comes close to statistical significance ($r = 0.08$).

More surprisingly, education has little impact on political involvement. The correlations for length of secular and seminary education are positive but small and statistically insignificant. As I argued in chapter 3, however, the locus and type of education does make a difference, even within a single denomination. In the SBC, clergy who studied at denominational colleges are modestly more active politically than those who attended other institutions, whether public or private, or did not attend college at all ($r = 0.14$). College major also makes a difference: students of traditional liberal arts disciplines are somewhat more active in politics than are those from professional and technical fields ($r = 0.13$). Finally, the locus of seminary education has an effect. Pastors who attended Southern Baptist Theological Seminary or Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary (which were until recently the most liberal SBC schools) are least active ($r = -0.20$). Those matriculating at conservative denominational schools such as Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary are more active ($r = 0.11$), but graduates of independent fundamentalist schools are the most active of all ($r = 0.15$).

These results confirm changes that have occurred in the social location of Southern Baptist activism. During the 1970s and early 1980s, socially "advantaged" clergy dominated SBC politics. Extensive education, higher social class origins, urban residence, and similar status measures all had strong positive correlations with participation, as did attendance at the more liberal Baptist seminaries (Guth 1989; Sapp 1975). Today socioeconomic factors have virtually no influence on ministerial involvement, and educational variables sometimes work differently than expected. Thus we must look elsewhere to understand the choice of political activism by contemporary Southern Baptist clergy.

Psychological Engagement. Many analysts argue that the most important personal political resources are attitudinal, not socioeconomic. Psychological dispositions such as strong political interest, a sense of political efficacy, and the willingness to cooperate with others lead to greater political activity (Putnam 1993; Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; Verba and Nie 1972). In the mass public, of course, these orientations often result from higher status and education, but among professional leaders the continuing experience of conducting many forms of "public" activity may substitute for status and schooling by producing attitudes that are conducive to participation. Indeed, if church

membership produces civic skills and attitudes (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995), church *leadership* should have an even stronger effect.

Among Baptist clergy, at least, psychological engagement is indeed more powerful than socioeconomic status. Participation is most strongly correlated with interest in politics ($r = 0.51$), but a pastor's confidence in his ability to influence the social and political views of the congregation (a vital type of professional efficacy) is also significant ($r = 0.24$). Willingness to cooperate politically with people of different faiths also bears a significant positive relationship to activism ($r = 0.22$). On the other hand, a perception that "it is difficult for ministers to know the proper political channels to use in accomplishing some goal" (which measures *low* political efficacy) does not discourage activism at all. Among contemporary SBC clergy, then, activism is tied much more strongly to psychological engagement than to socioeconomic status. Comparison with past studies indicates that this is a recent development (Guth 1989, 1996).

Professional Ideology

Theological Worldviews. Rather than focusing on socioeconomic resources or psychological engagement, most clergy studies have stressed other attitudes (especially theological beliefs) that highlight this-worldly political involvement, foster approval of the church's political role, and suggest that ministers should be politically active (Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974). Indeed, my colleagues and I previously have found that such theological and professional role orientations are powerful predictors of activism (Guth et al. 1997).

Given their centrality to clerical worldviews, theological perspectives have always been crucial in discussions of pastoral politics. Hadden (1969) and Quinley (1974) both found "this-worldly" modernists, who had abandoned supernatural Christian orthodoxy for a more liberal, naturalistic faith, to be far more active in politics than "otherworldly" traditionalists. Some scholars have argued, however, that it was *not* Christian orthodoxy that militated against political activity, but rather the dispensationalism gripping many orthodox Protestants (Boyer 1992; Wilcox, Linzey, and Jelen 1991). Dispensationalist beliefs emphasize the imminent return of Jesus, the end of this world, the priority of saving souls, and the futility of social and political reform. Naturally, dispensationalism discourages political activity.

There is much evidence, however, that the relationship between theologi-

cal perspectives and political activism has changed. Clergy who were not only orthodox but also dispensationalist fomented early Christian Right activism. While some scholars have argued that such beliefs were downplayed to facilitate activism, there is little survey evidence to confirm this contention (see Guth et al. 1997, 46–47). Rather, dispensationalists have modified their theories to accommodate a larger political role for Christians, including clergy. These revisions have been encapsulated in a new social theology, the "civic gospel" (Guth et al. 1997). This perspective connects dispensationalism's characteristic pessimism about human history with the perception that American society is sliding away from its Christian origins toward a new, secular, and sinful identity. Unlike earlier versions of dispensationalist social theology, the civic gospel holds out some prospect for social reform if "true Christians" act. Just as the Social Gospel of the early twentieth century provided theological liberals with an invitation into worldly politics, so too the new civic gospel supplies a rationale for conservative activity. Thus we might find the most orthodox and dispensationalist SBC clergy to be most active (Guth 1996).

To test all of these possibilities, I have calculated theological measures tapping *Christian orthodoxy, dispensationalism,* and the *civic gospel. Orthodoxy* is an additive index of items on the authority of Scripture, the centrality of Jesus to salvation, the historicity of Adam and Eve, the virgin birth, the existence of the devil, and the Second Coming. *Dispensationalism* includes questions on premillennialism, the Rapture of the church, and the special status of Israel in God's plan. The *civic gospel* measure incorporates five items that tap the theological meaning of American history and politics. These measures include the belief that the United States was founded as a Christian nation; that free enterprise is the only economic system truly compatible with Christian beliefs; that religious values are put at risk by dangerous groups in contemporary America; that there is only one Christian view on most political issues; and that it is hard for political liberals to be true Christians.[3]

Southern Baptist pastoral activism in 1996 correlates solidly with Christian orthodoxy ($r = 0.30$) despite the absence of much variation in this variable. Activism is tied even more strongly to dispensationalism, on which Baptist clergy differ a good deal ($r = 0.36$). Even more striking is the extent to which the civic gospel variable is associated with activism ($r = 0.38$). In fact, the only theological item revealing residual antipolitical effects of the older Baptist theology is a question that asks whether ministers think Christianity is primar-

ily spiritual in nature ($r = -0.10$). All of these findings confirm that Southern Baptist activism is now the province of the most theologically conservative clergy, who have formulated a new rationale for political involvement.

Role Orientations. Although theological perspectives may influence ministers' views on the legitimacy of social and political activism, their specific beliefs about such activity are likely to be embodied in stable role orientations shared by those with similar theological views. Quinley (1974) showed that in the 1960s heyday of "New Breed" political activism, modernist clergy held far more positive views on participation than did their orthodox brethren—and on virtually every imaginable activity. Even today in mainline Protestant denominations, theologically liberal clergy are still somewhat more likely to approve of activism, although the differences with evangelicals have certainly diminished since the 1960s. And in some denominations, such as the SBC, the most orthodox actually have *more* positive attitudes (Guth et al. 1997). In any event, it is reasonable to expect a strong link between role orientations and political activism, either because positive attitudes lead to greater activism or, as some argue, because greater activism produces more positive attitudes about ministerial involvement (see Conway 1991, 173–81).

Not surprisingly, ministers' approval scores for *individual political activity* and for *denominational activism* exhibit strong links to involvement ($r = 0.64$ and 0.48, respectively).[4] Thus how ministers conceive of the appropriate political behavior for clergy—and the proper functions of denominational agencies—is powerfully related to what they actually do. Initially at least, the size of these correlations suggests that professional beliefs (whether incorporating theology or political role orientations) are likely to overwhelm the influence of socioeconomic and other personal factors.

Issue Mobilization

Many analysts of political participation have stressed issue mobilization: the way in which political attachments, beliefs, and issues prompt people to become involved (see my discussion in chapter 3). Political scientists have long noted that partisan and ideological affections often stimulate activism. Sometimes they assume that *strength* of partisan and ideological commitment is key, whatever its *direction,* but more often politically active clergy display ideological and partisan "asymmetry." During particular eras either conserva-

tives or liberals may dominate (Nexon 1971; Verba and Nie 1972). This phenomenon may be explained in part by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady's argument that citizens with strong sentiments on "new" issues like abortion or the environment are activated by those feelings (1995, 391–415). If the national agenda is not balanced in its ideological incentives, we should expect eras of advantage for one side or the other.

It is important to explore how ideological and partisan variables might influence activity. First, to capture the impact of strong partisanship, I use "strength of Republican" and "strength of Democratic" identification measures. For the "strength of Republican" measure, any kind of Democrat or pure Independent is scored 0; an Independent who leans Republican, 1; a weak Republican, 2; and a Strong Republican, 3. The "strength of Democrat" measure follows a similar coding scheme. As it turns out, the stronger the Republican attachment, the greater the activism ($r = 0.40$), while strength of Democratic affiliation has a weak negative association with involvement ($r = -0.017$). The latter measure is somewhat limited, however, because only 12 percent of contemporary Baptist clergy are Democratic partisans or "leaners." As a more nuanced measure of partisanship, I use another measure based on a question that asks clergy whether Republicans or Democrats would do a better job with twelve major policy issues. Once again activism is much stronger among those who consistently favor the Republicans ($r = 0.42$).[5] Both measures confirm, then, that Republican loyalty encourages greater activism in 1996, while Democratic ties suppress it.

This Republican advantage may stem from the emphasis put on "moral issues" by various GOP factions in recent years. Following the same procedure used by Guth and colleagues (1997), I derived scores for ministers on the *moral reform* and *social justice* agendas.[6] Moral issues such as abortion, gay rights, school prayer, and gambling dominate the agendas of most SBC pastors, but a sizable minority are more inclined to worry about social welfare policies, the environment, women's rights, and similar questions. Here again we see the influence of attachment to conservative issues. Preoccupation with the moral reform agenda—but not concern about the social justice agenda—is strongly correlated with activism ($r = 0.46$ and 0.05, respectively).

Finally, ministers' stances on specific issues and their self-identified ideology may influence their activity. Here two alternative tests produce almost identical conclusions. First, an issue conservatism score based on twenty-one

policy items has a strong positive link to activism ($r = 0.48$), but strong liberalism has a substantial negative link ($r = -0.32$).[7] A second analysis using a bifurcated ideological self-identification scale reveals that conservatives are *more* active and liberals are *less* active (data not shown). It is quite clear that SBC clergy are a contemporary case of Verba and Nie's "hyperactive Republicans," mobilized by strong conservative beliefs (1972, 224–28). To summarize: no matter how I tap partisanship and ideology, stronger Republican identification, moral issue concerns, and political conservatism all point to greater activism. Strong Democratic and liberal commitments work against activism—at least in the SBC context during the 1996 election.

Organizational Activity

Political scientists have argued that activism is also the result of organizational mobilization. This may take the form of party efforts to turn out the vote (Teixeira 1992), interest group leaders seeking to elicit member activity (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995), or other institutions attempting to activate a segment of the citizenry. As I discussed in chapter 3, organizational mobilization has been neglected in studies of clerical politics, but it should be especially pertinent to SBC clergy, who are enmeshed in complex organizational networks. They collaborate with other ministers in local Baptist associations, state conventions, and national bodies including the Southern Baptist Convention itself and its new competitor, the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship. They often hold denominational office and assume official responsibility. Such ministers are employed by individual congregations (and dismissed by them). And they join external organizations working for special causes, which makes them the target of communications from many sources, including the specialized religious media.

Denominational Context. For Baptist clergy, intradenominational networks are crucial given the SBC's long history of separatism, institutional self-sufficiency, and contentious internal politics. Denominational activity is a traditional outlet for clerical ambitions and may well influence political involvement. In 1996 fully 38 percent of SBC pastors reported attending five or more national conventions, while 55 percent held local association office, 14 percent a state convention office, and 6 percent a national SBC post. The political implications of such responsibilities are not clear, however. On the one

hand, internal responsibilities may well divert energies from "outside" politics, leaving SBC activists less involved in "real" politics. (The term *politics* without modifiers in the SBC usually means "denominational politics.") On the other hand, clergy might become politicized due to skills they develop while doing internal tasks, from networks and connections they maintain, and through exposure to issues beyond the local church.

Such influences probably vary by organizational level. The national SBC is a fellow traveler with the Christian Right, and its conventions have often resembled Republican political rallies (especially in presidential years). Nevertheless, until recently most state conventions tended to represent traditional Baptist separatism and were not especially political. Local associations were perhaps least affected by Christian Right mobilization but have now been politicized in many areas.

Table 9.1 shows that denominational activism has only a very modest spillover effect on political activity. Frequent attendance at SBC meetings has a weak positive association with political activity, but the coefficient is not quite significant. Officeholding in state and national Baptist conventions has no relationship to political involvement, but local officeholding has a modest positive correlation. On the whole, however, denominational activism has only a small, if positive, connection with political activism. While this may represent no more than a tendency for clergy with activist personalities to get involved on all fronts, at least it shows that denominational work does not substitute for, or preclude, political involvement.

More explicitly political associations inside the SBC may also have some importance, as several theological and political groups contend for influence. Conservative political interests have been led by Richard Land, head of the Christian Life Commission (now called the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission), who established a Washington lobbying office and led the move for greater denominational involvement in national politics. On the other side the Alliance of Baptists, which rejects the SBC–Christian Right alliance, still harbors lonely SBC liberals. The Cooperative Baptist Fellowship (CBF) is a much larger dissident group of "denominational loyalists" seeking alternative vehicles for mission projects, theological education, and other functions. Although CBF leaders are much more moderate politically than the current SBC elite, they reject denominational "politicization." Ministerial support for the old Christian Life Commission is positively correlated with activism, while

TABLE 9.1. *Southern Baptist Clergy's Organizational Mobilization and Political Participation*

	Pearson's *r*
Denominational mobilization	
Held local office	0.14*
Attended SBC meetings	0.08
Held national office	0.03
Held state office	0.03
Christian Life Commission supporter	0.27**
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship member	−0.19*
Baptist Alliance member	−0.07
Congregational context	
Is more conservative than church	0.24**
Is more liberal than church	−0.14*
Has working-class congregation	0.09
Church approves of activism	0.07
Length of tenure at church	−0.04
Size of congregation	0.04
National organization membership	
Christian Coalition	0.32**
American Family Association	0.24**
Focus on the Family	0.16*
Campaign mobilization	
Religious group contact	0.21**
Laity contact	0.15*
Party or candidate contact	0.08
Denominational contact	0.07
Total contact index	0.22**
Sources of political information	
Christian radio	0.39**
Religious organizations	0.36**
Denominational material	0.29**
Other clergy	0.27**
Religious magazines	0.26**
Direct mail	0.23**
Religious TV	0.18*
Network TV	−0.11*

SOURCE: Compiled by author from 1996 surveys of Southern Baptist ministers. $N = 361$.

NOTE: $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.001$

CBF membership is negatively related to political activity, as was the case in 1992 (see Guth 1996). Alliance members are also less active, but the correlation is not statistically significant.

Congregational Context. How do ministers' congregations influence their activity? Clergy and laity are tightly linked in the Baptist congregational polity, which places employment decisions solely within local churches. This makes the congregation an important potential constraint on ministerial activism.

Hostile parishioners who rejected ministerial activism and favored more conservative politics reined in the "New Breed" liberals of the 1960s (Balmer 1996; Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974). Although most surveys, including mine, find evangelical clergy much more in tune with their laity on both counts, some observers have seen a new "gathering storm" in these churches, as conservative activists antagonize a more moderate laity (Campolo 1995).

Unfortunately, I have no direct measures of congregational attitudes toward activism, or of congregational ideology, so I rely instead on ministers' own assessments of whether their congregations would approve of them undertaking a large number of political actions both inside and outside of the church. As successful Baptist pastors survive by "reading" the people, their judgments are probably not far out of line, but their actions are governed by perceptions, not reality (see Luttbeg and Zeigler 1966).[8] The survey asked ministers to compare their own political ideology to that of their members on a five-point scale ranging from "my political views are much more conservative" to "my political views are much more liberal." As it turns out, the mere extent of political differences between pastor and congregation has little relationship to activism, so I use scores tapping both *magnitude* and *direction* (more liberal, more conservative) of any gap.[9]

Given the typical high level of agreement between pastor and people, it is not surprising that congregational factors have only a modest impact on clergy participation. There is little support for the "credit building" theory that activism is most likely among clergy with long tenure in a church. In fact, the correlation in table 9.1 actually runs in the wrong direction but is insignificant. On the other hand, congregational approval of activism has a positive coefficient that just misses statistical significance. Ideological differences have an asymmetric effect: clergy more liberal than their congregations are less active, as might be expected, but ministers who perceive themselves as more conservative are more active, replicating earlier findings (Guth 1996).

National Political Organizations. As I argued in chapter 3, most studies of clerical activism do little to link ministers with the larger political environment. Making that connection seems especially appropriate in the Baptist case. Whatever internal associations and congregational influences may affect SBC clergy, they have also been the targets of outside organizations. To tap such linkages, the survey asks ministers whether they belong to a series of re-

ligious interest groups. As I discovered in 1992, Baptist ministers join such groups in fairly large numbers (Guth 1996, 163). In 1996 the most popular organization was Dr. James Dobson's Focus on the Family, which claims 15 percent of SBC ministers, followed by the Christian Coalition at 8 percent and Donald Wildmon's American Family Association (AFA) with 7 percent. All together, 20 percent of all SBC clergy report membership in at least one conservative organization, while 8 percent belong to two or more. Others do not join, but "feel close" to these groups (80 percent feel close to Focus on the Family, 57 percent to AFA, and 46 percent to the Christian Coalition). Only a few ministers join more liberal groups such as Bread for the World and Americans United for Separation of Church and State (despite the prominent role Southern Baptist clergy have played in each), but a significant number feel close to these groups.

Membership in religious interest groups correlates positively with political activity, although at differing levels. The correlation is strongest for Christian Coalition, weaker for AFA, and even more modest for Focus on the Family. Of course, this association may simply represent a tendency for politically motivated ministers to join politically active religious groups, but it is fascinating that members are engaged in the very activities that each organization promotes. Members of Focus on the Family and the Christian Coalition, for example, participate heavily in voter registration drives, while AFA members favor petition campaigns and issue boycotts like the AFA's much-publicized national boycott of Disney enterprises (which the SBC itself eventually joined). If organizational affiliation does not stimulate activism, at least it channels that activism.

Campaign Mobilization: The Impact of Contacts and Communications. Political activism by clergy, especially during a presidential election year, may also be influenced by the mobilization efforts of political parties, candidate organizations, religious interest groups, denominational officials, and perhaps even laity. Similarly, the information sources on which clergy rely, especially evangelical television and radio programs laden with political content, might make a difference in clergy involvement.

Clergy are indeed popular during election years: 58 percent say they were contacted by religious organizations attempting to influence their vote; 57 percent heard from party or candidate groups; 16 percent remember efforts

by denominational sources; and another 7 percent were contacted by laity from their church. Table 9.1 shows that all four types of contact are positively correlated with activity, but only those from religious organizations and laity are statistically significant. An index of the total number of contacts also correlates significantly with involvement. Outside mobilization efforts have an impact, then, but contacts with religious or congregational associations have the most effect.

Ministers' favorite political information sources also have a significant bearing on activity. Those who rely on network television news, which is supposedly America's most common source of campaign information, were actually less politically involved. But, Christian radio, information from religious groups, denominational materials, other clergy, religious magazines, and direct mail all have solid correlations with involvement. Religious television trails these sources in terms of importance.[10] Thus, those clergy who are most integrated into communications networks dominated by conservative Christian activists are most prone to participate in politics. The strong correlations with use of religious radio and communications from religious groups reveal the special importance of these sources.

A Combined Model of Clerical Activism

Table 9.2 presents a combined model explaining political activism among Southern Baptist pastors in 1996. To simplify the analysis, I ran a series of multiple ordinary least squares regression analyses (with mean substitution for missing data) to discover which variables from each of the four theoretical perspectives demonstrate substantive influence. I then entered those with a substantive influence into a final regression analysis, eliminating those that contribute little power to the analysis. This process produced an elegant model with only ten variables, which nevertheless explains a very respectable 60 percent of the variance.

First, observe that no social status variable survives the final regression analysis. Among SBC clergy, social class background, current social class, and educational attainments do nothing to explain activism once attitudinal variables are in the equation. The most important of these factors predicting activism levels, not surprisingly, is a minister's approval of political activity, while political interest, concern about moral issues, strength of conservative

TABLE 9.2. *Determinants of Overall Pastoral Activism*

	Coefficient
Psychological engagement	
Level of interest in politics	0.21**
Role orientations	
Approves of political activity	0.38**
Issue mobilization	
Party performance (GOP better)	0.15*
Conservatism	0.11*
Moral agenda	0.10*
Organizational mobilization	
Christian Coalition member	0.13**
Religious group contact	0.10*
Church approves of activism	0.09*
Uses Christian radio for information	0.09*
Size of church	0.07*
Adjusted R^2	0.60

SOURCE: Compiled by author from 1996 surveys of Southern Baptist ministers. $N = 361$.
NOTE: $^*p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.001$

convictions, and strong preference for the Republicans add explanatory power. In addition, organizational influences persist: Christian Coalition members are significantly more involved in politics, even when all other factors are taken into account, as are those who report campaign contacts from religious organizations or rely on religious radio. The congregational context also matters: ministers whose parishioners approve of their political activity are more active, as are clergy from larger churches.

Interestingly, the results do not change much if I omit political role orientations from the equation. Given the high correlation between approval of activism and activism itself, I ran the analysis again without that variable. When the approval index is omitted, political interest, partisanship, and ideology largely absorb its effects and become even more powerful explanations for activism. Moreover, the coefficient for political efficacy becomes strong and significant, and organizational mobilization variables play a somewhat larger role (data not shown). The reduced equation still explains 52 percent of the variance. Thus, although approval of activism makes a unique contribution to the equation, other variables also have an important influence on participation.

What is noticeable in the final analysis, however specified, is the absence of theological variables. The absence of orthodoxy, dispensationalism, and the civic gospel from the final equation may be puzzling, as each had a strong bi-

variate correlation with activism. The influence of the theological variables, however, is entirely captured by other variables in the analysis (which, of course, they influence) such as role approval, ideology, and partisanship (Guth et al. 1997). Once these latter factors are in the equation, theological orientations add no explanatory power. Their influence is instead *indirect:* they play a critical role in producing ideological stances and partisanship, which in turn produce political activism.

This chapter opens the door to reconsidering some of the old conventional wisdom about political participation by Protestant clergy. Political activity among Southern Baptist pastors is ultimately rooted in theologies long thought inimical to activism: an otherworldly orthodoxy, often buttressed by dispensationalist beliefs. Adherents to these "conservative" theological perspectives have reoriented themselves to contemporary politics by adopting a new social theology, the civic gospel, which connects historic Baptist beliefs with the state of the contemporary world in a way that suggests the need for activism. But theology and social theology operate through new attitudes toward political activism, the mobilizing power of abortion, gay rights, prayer in school and other "culture war" issues, and strong conservative ideological commitments encapsulated in Republican partisanship. Indeed, these new attitudes and concerns are intense enough even to overcome some socioeconomic disadvantages, abetted perhaps by the activity of Christian Right groups (and other supporting organizations and political media).

What should we expect in the future? First, the results of the 1996 survey bolster the earlier argument that most SBC clergy will remain aligned with the Republicans (Guth 1996, 169). Fellow Southern Baptists Bill Clinton and Al Gore had no more luck in attracting them back to their ancient Democratic home in 1996 than they had in 1992—almost 80 percent voted for Bob Dole. No doubt participation in the politics of their communities will remain at a higher plateau than was the case a generation ago. The high levels of political interest, sense of efficacy, and approval of participation ensure that much. The infrastructure of Baptist associations, Christian political groups, religious radio stations, and specialized religious media may serve to sustain or even bolster this new activism or to direct it toward special causes.

Having said this, we must be careful not to repeat Quinley's (1974) mistake in assuming a permanent connection between a particular religious perspec-

tive and political activity. The actual level of clergy participation at any time, especially among theological conservatives, is indeterminate. Activism will reflect many external forces: the nature of the issues on the federal, state, and local political agendas; the attractiveness of Republican candidates, especially their commitment to conservative social values; the activities of Christian Right organizations; and perhaps the encouragement provided by denominational agencies and congregations. As most of these factors are variables, not constants, participation will continue to fluctuate in both the amount and the targets of activity. Whatever the variations, however, Southern Baptist clergy have become one activist building block in an increasingly Solid *Republican* South.

At the same time, we must not assume that patterns in one conservative denomination, however prominent, are typical of all evangelicals, as ministers in other denominations may well be less active than Southern Baptists (Guth et al. 1997). Still, the same forces influencing the Southern Baptist Convention may also affect clergy in other evangelical denominations (see chapter 10 for the case of the Christian Reformed Church). The leaders of the burgeoning new nondenominational megachurches are already prominent in both local politics and in the Christian Right. It is important to recognize the ways in which theology, denominational traditions and structures (or the lack thereof), regional context, lay attitudes, and leadership strategies influence the politics of preachers in "the new American mainline," evangelical Protestantism.

10 Reformed Preachers in Politics

JAMES M. PENNING AND
CORWIN E. SMIDT

In recent years, scholars have paid increased attention to the political role of the clergy, and evidence is growing that ministers do, in fact, play important political roles (Crawford and Olson chapter 7; Guth et al. 1997; Olson 1997). As each chapter in this volume reveals, ministers make important political choices regarding the nature and extent of their political activities, with potentially significant consequences for the political attitudes and political participation of members of their congregations.

Research on the politics of clergy reveals that there are a variety of ways in which ministers may influence the political attitudes and political participation of their congregations. As Jelen notes in chapter 2, ministers possess important personal resources, including verbal ability and high prestige and credibility, which can effectively be employed in the political arena. In addition, clergy possess politically useful institutional resources such as access to facilities, transportation, and volunteer networks that can enhance their political effectiveness. And perhaps most important, ministers have regular access to receptive audiences of congregants (Penning and Smidt 2000). Of course, as several chapters in this volume illustrate, not all ministers mobilize these resources in the political arena. Much depends on factors such as the nature of the congregation, the pastor's personality and political skills, and the political context within which they work (Cavendish chapter 13; Crawford and Olson chapter 7; Vidich and Bensman 1968, 329). Nevertheless, ministers certainly have the potential to draw upon these resources should they decide to mobilize others on behalf of their political concerns.

While clergy make important choices related to their political activities, we lack sufficient information regarding the range of political activities in which they engage (see Guth chapter 3). Moreover, relatively few studies have undertaken a systematic effort to explain why some but not all religious leaders become very active in politics (Guth and Kellstedt 1997, 1). Thus, even in such relatively well-examined areas as the politics of the Christian Right, our

knowledge of clergy's political activities remains limited (Guth 1996, 14). In fact, some have contended that Protestant clergy are America's most underappreciated political elite (Wald 1997, 222).

The most recent major work on the politics of Protestant clergy in the United States is *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997), in which the authors examined the politics of clergy across eight different denominations.[1] This study revealed considerable variation in the nature and extent of clergy political activism. The authors concluded that this variation is explained less well by demographic or personal traits (though education did prove to be important) than by ideational differences—issues of theology, social theology, and political attitudes (Guth et al. 1997, 190–91).

Particular attention was given in *The Bully Pulpit* to the political implications of the division of Protestantism into two parties or camps. This bifurcation of American Protestantism began to develop following the Civil War, as proponents of liberal theology sought to reconcile Scripture with modern science and incorporate the findings of higher criticism, and while proponents of more traditional conservative theology rejected Darwin, higher criticism, and the Social Gospel (Wuthnow 1988). This division had profound political consequences, particularly after the Scopes trial of 1925, as clergy in the conservative camp tended to withdraw from politics and focus their attention on evangelism. Even today, despite the recent growth of the Christian Right, many conservative pastors continue to emphasize soul winning rather than social involvement (Guth 1996; Jelen 1993; Zwier 1982). This focus is reinforced both by premillennialist theology, which emphasizes the imminent Second Coming of Jesus Christ (Wilcox, Linzey, and Jelen 1991), and by many ministers' desire to maintain congregational unity and social standing in the larger community (Guth 1996, 2). On the other hand, theologically liberal clergy, with their focus on the Social Gospel, have tended to remain politically active through much of this century. Arguably, though, this activity reached its peak in the 1960s and 1970s when liberal clergy played major roles in the civil rights and anti–Vietnam War movements (Wald 1997, 294–95).

Today, however, there is evidence that this participation gap between clergy from the two camps may have narrowed. Christian Right organizations such as the Moral Majority, Christian Coalition, Citizens for Traditional Values, and the American Family Association have worked with considerable success

to mobilize theologically conservative Protestant clergy for political action (Berkowitz and Green 1997; Penning 1998). Nevertheless, as late as 1988 when data for *The Bully Pulpit* were collected, differences continued to exist between traditional and modernist clergy with regard to both the nature and extent of their political involvement.

The Political Activism of CRC and RCA Clergy

This chapter focuses on the politics of clergy from the Christian Reformed Church (CRC) and the Reformed Church in America (RCA). Specifically, we ask (1) What is the nature and extent of political involvement among clergy within these two denominations? (2) How can we explain such involvement? (3) Is there any evidence of convergence in the political activity of theologically liberal and conservative ministers?

Why study clergy from these two denominations? First, it fills a void. While clergy from the CRC and RCA were among those from the eight denominations analyzed in *The Bully Pulpit,* no analysis of the political activism of clergy from these two denominations was included in the study. Second, these two denominations are of interest because while they are closely related ethnically (with roots among Dutch immigrants) and doctrinally (adhering to Calvinist theology), they are rooted in different social contexts and institutional networks.[2] The RCA was a charter member of the old Federal Council of Churches and is a charter member of the present National Council of Churches, while the CRC is a member of the National Association of Evangelicals.[3] By examining the politics of clergy from two theologically related but nonetheless distinct denominations, we can better understand the role played by contextual variables in encouraging or discouraging clergy activism.

Data for this study are drawn primarily from questionnaires mailed to a random sample of clergy in the CRC and RCA in 1997. While the two denominations differ slightly in size,[4] they have a roughly equal number of active clergy. Accordingly, a total of 500 questionnaires were mailed to randomly selected CRC ministers and another 500 to randomly selected RCA ministers, producing identical response rates of 52 percent for each denomination and a total *N* of 520 ministers.

Patterns of Clerical Activism in the CRC and RCA

How politically active are CRC and RCA clergy? What is the nature of their political activity? Is theological orthodoxy related to that activity in any way? We address these questions in tables 10.1 through 10.4. In each table we examine various types of self-reported clergy political activity both over the respondents' entire ministerial careers and in the presidential election year of 1996. In addition, we cross-tabulate each type of political activity or involvement using an index of theological orthodoxy ranging from 1 (most orthodox) to 4 (most modernist). The orthodoxy measure is a simple additive index of respondents' answers to three questions: whether Jesus provides the only way until salvation, whether the devil literally exists, and whether the Bible is inerrant in religious, historical, and scientific domains.[5] Clergy who score 1 agree with all these tenets, while clergy who score 4 disagree.

The first half of table 10.1 examines the ministers' record of making public political pronouncements. One way ministers can make such pronouncements, of course, is by touching on a political issue in a sermon. Clergy surveyed for *The Bully Pulpit* reported that they frequently touched upon political issues in sermons (Guth et al. 1997, 164). This is also the case for nearly all ministers in both the RCA and the CRC. Nearly all of them report talking about political issues in sermons at some point during their careers, and over three-quarters report doing so in 1996 alone. Few differences appear between CRC and RCA ministers on this matter, but the orthodox-progressive split is meaningful. More orthodox CRC ministers were more likely to have touched on a political issue in 1996, and more orthodox RCA ministers were more likely to have touched on a political issue both over their careers and in 1996. This pattern stands in contrast to the data presented in *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997), which shows that modernists were more likely to have touched on issues both during their careers and in the presidential election year of 1988 than were orthodox clergy.

Although it is difficult to explain these findings, we can suggest several possibilities. First, the findings may reflect the fact that our analysis focuses on variation within two centrist denominations. The modernist edge reported by Guth and colleagues (1997) might have remained had we examined clergy across a breadth of denominations. Second, more evangelical or orthodox seg-

ments of the clergy may have continued to become more political over the past decade, so perhaps the previous patterns have now been reversed. Third, such changes may also be related to generational replacement of older, less energetic clergy by younger, more orthodox and politically engaged clergy. Finally, the efforts of the Dole campaign or the Christian Right to emphasize "family values" in 1996 may have sparked pulpit activity by the more orthodox pastors, while the likely reelection of President Clinton did little to move more modernist clergy into such engagement.

A more extreme form of political activity is to preach a whole sermon on a political issue. Not surprisingly, fewer ministers report taking this step. Slightly more than half of both CRC and RCA ministers report having done so in their career, while approximately a quarter of the ministers in each denomination report doing so in 1996. These findings show, somewhat surprisingly, that RCA and CRC clergy are less prone to preach entire sermons on political issues than are ministers in other denominations. Guth and colleagues report that 79 percent of all clergy and 60 percent of orthodox clergy have preached political sermons (Guth 1997, 165). Once again, contrary to previous patterns, we found a slight tendency for more orthodox CRC and RCA ministers to engage in such political preaching.

When ministers deal with political issues in their sermons, do they take a stand? Although doing so is fraught with potential dangers for them, the vast majority of ministers (86 percent of CRC and 77 percent of RCA) indicate that they have done so during their careers. These levels show that CRC and RCA clergy are somewhat more likely to take political stands in the pulpit than are pastors in other denominations. Averages for CRC and RCA clergy far exceed the 56 percent average reported in *The Bully Pulpit* (Guth et al. 1997, 165). In fact, about half of the CRC and RCA ministers reported taking a pulpit stand on a political issue in 1996 alone. While more modernist ministers in both denominations proved somewhat more likely to report having done so over their careers, more orthodox ministers, particularly those in the CRC, were more likely to report having done so in 1996.

Do ministers feel freer to express their political views in public, when they are not in the pulpit? Table 10.1 shows that they do indeed. Well over 90 percent of the ministers from each denomination indicate that they have expressed their political views in public at some point during their careers, and over 60 percent of each group reported doing so in 1996. In all cases, more

TABLE 10.1. *Political Pronouncements and Candidate Activities of Clergy in the Christian Reformed Church and Reformed Church in America, by Degree of Orthodoxy*

		All	1 (Orthodox)	2	3	4 (Modernist)	*r*
		Political Pronouncements					
Touched on issue in sermon							
CRC	Career	99	98	98	100	100	0.09
	1996	77	80	71	81	76	−0.01
RCA	Career	97	97	96	97	96	−0.02
	1996	76	81	76	72	74	−0.07
Preached whole sermon on issue							
CRC	Career	55	58	52	57	52	−0.03
	1996	28	34	22	24	30	−0.05
RCA	Career	56	50	63	48	66	0.07
	1996	24	33	26	13	24	−0.12
Took pulpit stand on political issue							
CRC	Career	86	82	88	85	91	0.07
	1996	52	63	48	48	46	−0.13*
RCA	Career	77	72	79	74	84	0.08
	1996	45	49	42	43	44	−0.03
Took public stand on political issue							
CRC	Career	95	92	95	96	100	0.11
	1996	63	64	58	68	64	0.02
RCA	Career	94	93	95	93	96	0.03
	1996	61	64	59	53	70	0.01
		Candidate Activity					
Publicly endorsed candidate							
CRC	Career	74	76	68	82	67	−0.01
	1996	33	42	29	31	24	−0.12
RCA	Career	66	71	66	61	68	−0.04
	1996	33	41	35	27	31	−0.10
Prayed publicly for candidate							
CRC	Career	64	77	63	60	39	−0.24**
	1996	49	61	47	46	29	−0.19**
RCA	Career	59	64	55	55	60	−0.04
	1996	44	53	47	38	36	−0.14
Endorsed candidate from pulpit							
CRC	Career	7	10	5	6	6	−0.05
	1996	1	2	0	0	0	−0.10
RCA	Career	3	1	4	3	4	0.05
	1996	+	0	0	0	2	0.09

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1996 surveys of Reformed clergy. $N = 520$.
NOTE: + less than 1 percent; *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.001$.

modernist ministers proved somewhat more likely to take public political stands than did more orthodox ministers. These patterns comport well with previous findings (Guth et al. 1997).

Ministers can engage in politics not only by taking stands on issues but also by endorsing candidates. Public endorsement of candidates is actually quite

common among ministers. Once again CRC pastors proved to be more active over the course of their careers than RCA pastors. While approximately three-fourths of CRC pastors say they have endorsed candidates, only two-thirds of RCA ministers say they have also done so. The pattern among RCA pastors is more reflective of the national norm (Guth et al. 1997, 166). On the other hand, an identical 33 percent of ministers from each denomination report endorsing candidates in the presidential election year of 1996, which is down slightly from the 41 percent level evident among clergy in the 1988 election year (Guth et al. 1997, 166). In general, orthodox pastors are slightly more active in publicly endorsing candidates than are more modernist ministers.

A majority of ministers in both denominations also report praying publicly for one or more political candidates during their careers. Guth and colleagues show that Reformed clergy are more likely to pray for candidates than are clergy in some other denominations, including the Assemblies of God and the United Methodist Church (1997, 166). While praying for candidates is ordinarily less common than publicly endorsing candidates in these ministers' careers, the reverse was true in 1996. Major differences between clergy from the two denominations also appear on the candidate prayer matter with respect to the orthodoxy index. As previous studies (such as Guth et al. 1997) have shown, more orthodox clergy are more likely to pray publicly for candidates than are modernist clergy in both denominations (and this pattern is far more pronounced in the CRC than in the RCA).

One of the more controversial practices ministers can undertake is the public endorsement of candidates from the pulpit. Not surprisingly, few ministers from either the CRC or the RCA report endorsing candidates in this way, so we cannot make meaningful distinctions on the basis of orthodoxy. Nevertheless, the overall pattern, both with regard to level and direction, appears to reflect patterns previously reported.

Do ministers go beyond endorsing candidates and actually campaign for them? Table 10.2 indicates that, for the most part, they do not engage in heavy campaigning. Relatively few ministers in either denomination (37 percent of CRC respondents and 25 percent of RCA respondents) report having campaigned for a candidate at any point in their career. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that clergy campaign more than the mass public, and CRC clergy exceed the national norm (33 percent) for clergy (Guth et al. 1997, 166).

But CRC and RCA pastors were less engaged in the political process in the

TABLE 10.2. *Campaign Activities of Reformed Clergy, by Degree of Orthodoxy*

	All	1 (Orthodox)	2	3	4 (Modernist)	*r*
Campaigned for a candidate						
CRC Career	37	41	25	43	36	0.01
1996	7	7	5	9	6	0.01
RCA Career	25	25	23	23	30	0.03
1996	5	7	6	3	6	−0.04
Involved in 1996 presidential campaign						
Primaries CRC	12	16	9	9	13	−0.05
RCA	13	11	14	12	14	0.02
General election CRC	27	36	19	28	19	−0.11
RCA	25	27	25	20	32	0.02
Ran for public office						
CRC Career	3	4	3	2	3	−0.03
1996	+	0	0	0	3	0.11
RCA Career	5	7	9	3	0	−0.13*
1996	+	1	0	0	0	−0.08
Tried to affect someone's vote						
CRC Career	69	69	66	69	76	0.04
1996	26	40	17	22	18	−0.17**
RCA Career	64	64	66	52	78	0.05
1996	27	26	31	19	32	0.00

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1996 surveys of Reformed clergy. $N = 520$.
NOTE: + less than 1 percent; $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.01$.

1996 election than were clergy as a whole in the 1988 election. For example, 10 percent of all clergy surveyed for *The Bully Pulpit* reported that they actively campaigned for a candidate in 1988, whereas only 7 percent of CRC and 5 percent of RCA pastors reported doing so in the 1996 election (Guth et al. 1997). Likewise, whereas 18 percent of all clergy reported being active supporters of a candidate in the presidential primaries of 1988, only 12 percent of CRC ministers and 13 percent of RCA ministers say they actively supported a candidate during the 1996 presidential primaries.

Despite their relative aversion to many other forms of campaign-related activity, many clergy say they try to persuade others to vote for specific candidates. Approximately two-thirds of the ministers in each denomination say they have tried at some point in their career to influence someone else's vote.[6] In 1996 approximately a quarter of the ministers in each denomination reported engaging in such persuasion, and at least for CRC ministers, it was the most orthodox who were most active.

What accounts for the lower level of campaign activity by CRC and RCA clergy in 1996 compared to levels for clergy as a whole in 1988? Does this drop

in activity mean that clergy are withdrawing from the political arena, or does their activity vary by denomination or election? While our data do not permit us to answer these questions conclusively, it is likely that the difference in patterns across the two time periods is more a reflection of the differences between the 1988 and 1996 campaigns. In 1988 no incumbent president was running for reelection, so the election's outcome was much more uncertain. Moreover, the primary election contest in both parties was not nearly as frontloaded in 1988 as it was in 1996. The outcome of each party's nomination was in doubt for a longer period of time during the 1988 primary process than was the case in 1996. There was no contest on the Democratic side in 1996 because Clinton sought reelection, and Dole secured the Republican Party's nomination early in the primary campaign. As a result, there were fewer opportunities for meaningful or protracted involvement in the 1996 presidential campaign than would have been the case in 1988. Moreover, President Clinton's commanding lead in public opinion polls left little incentive for clergy to engage in the general election campaign in 1996 as compared with 1988.

Clergy might also be involved in organizational activities such as supporting, joining, or even forming a political action group. Table 10.3 reveals that the most frequent organizational activity in which pastors engaged was contributing money to political committees. Approximately two-thirds of both the CRC and RCA ministers indicated that they had made at least one political contribution at some point in their careers. While these levels of contribution exceed levels for clergy as a whole as reported in *The Bully Pulpit* (57 percent), the relationship between the level of orthodoxy and political contributing is weaker than that reported by Guth and colleagues (1997). Moreover, only about a quarter of both CRC and RCA clergy made a contribution during the 1996 election campaign, a level slightly less than that for clergy in 1988. Less than half of the clergy we surveyed report joining a national political organization sometime during their career (39 percent for each denomination), while only about one in ten report doing so during the 1996 election (10 percent CRC; 12 percent RCA). While the former pattern is consistent with career reports from other clergy, the latter is slightly lower than reports from 1988 indicate (Guth et al. 1997).

Perhaps, though, Reformed ministers tend to focus their politics closer to home by seeking to influence their congregations' politics. Table 10.3 provides support for this idea. One relatively popular ministerial activity is forming a

TABLE 10.3. *Joining and Church Activities of Reformed Clergy, by Degree of Orthodoxy*

		All	1 (Orthodox)	2	3	4 (Modernist)	*r*
		Joining Organizations					
Made financial contribution							
CRC	Career	68	64	64	77	67	0.07
	1996	26	22	30	29	24	−0.04
RCA	Career	65	64	66	51	84	0.08
	1996	22	22	22	10	36	0.05
Joined national political organization							
CRC	Career	39	35	39	40	52	0.10
	1996	10	10	11	6	15	0.01
RCA	Career	39	42	32	30	54	0.05
	1996	12	13	11	9	16	0.02
		In-church Activity					
Formed study group in church							
CRC	Career	47	38	41	49	76	0.21***
	1996	7	6	5	3	21	0.12
RCA	Career	56	36	50	64	78	0.30***
	1996	9	4	7	6	20	0.17**
Formed action group in church							
CRC	Career	34	33	33	28	49	0.05
	1996	3	1	5	3	6	0.07
RCA	Career	33	17	29	28	38	0.16*
	1996	6	4	6	4	10	0.07

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1996 surveys of Reformed clergy. $N = 520$.
NOTE: $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{***}p < 0.001$.

political study group at church, with 47 percent of CRC ministers and 56 percent of RCA ministers forming such groups at some point in their careers. But this activity was rare (7 percent CRC; 9 percent RCA) in 1996. At times, ministers go beyond encouraging the formation of mere study groups and instead help to create organized action groups in their churches. About a third of the respondents, regardless of denomination, indicate that they had organized an action group, though very few clergy report doing so in 1996. But there is a strong positive relationship between modernist theology and the formation of both study and action groups in church across one's pastoral career, which is consistent with previous findings (Guth et al. 1997, 169–71).

Table 10.4 provides data on yet another category of political involvement: contacting activities. One such activity involves circulating petitions, which is an activity generally designed to get the attention of public officials on important issues. Almost all ministers in both denominations report circulating

a petition sometime during their careers. Moreover, slightly more than half of the ministers in each denomination report circulating a petition in 1996. With the exception of RCA ministers in 1996, modernists were slightly more active in circulating petitions than were orthodox ministers.

Ministers from both the CRC and RCA also contact their public officials with great frequency; fully 86 percent of the CRC and 90 percent of the RCA ministers report contacting public officials at some point in their careers. The comparable percentages for 1996 were 41 percent (CRC) and 51 percent (RCA), and we found few differences between orthodox and modernist ministers in terms of contacting public officials. On the other hand, ministers were somewhat less likely to write a letter to the editor of a newspaper, perhaps because writing such a letter tends to be somewhat more public (and hence controversial) than making contact with a public official. Even so, 51 percent of the CRC clergy and 60 percent of the RCA clergy say they have written a letter to the editor during their careers. In general, modernist ministers are slightly more involved in contacting activities than are orthodox ministers. With the exceptions of CRC ministers circulating more petitions in 1996 and RCA ministers writing more letters to the editor during their careers, the gaps are not particularly large.

TABLE 10.4. *Contacting and Protest Activities of Reformed Clergy, by Degree of Orthodoxy*

		All	1 Orthodox	2	3	4 Modernist	*r*
Circulated a petition							
CRC	Career	96	94	97	96	97	0.04
	1996	50	39	53	57	55	0.13*
RCA	Career	95	94	96	90	100	0.03
	1996	52	52	46	46	52	−0.03
Contacted a public official							
CRC	Career	86	85	84	90	82	0.01
	1996	41	45	30	44	43	0.00
RCA	Career	90	85	93	86	98	0.11
	1996	51	54	53	40	58	−0.02
Wrote a letter to the editor							
CRC	Career	51	49	47	60	49	0.05
	1996	10	11	7	10	12	0.01
RCA	Career	6	47	68	57	74	0.16**
	1996	14	16	11	7	22	0.03

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1996 surveys of Reformed clergy. $N = 520$.
NOTE: $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.01$.

Explaining Clerical Activism in the CRC and RCA

The theological factors that shape clerical political engagement are not limited to positions related to doctrinal orthodoxy. Stands related to matters of social theology also serve to shape the choices clergy make about political activism (Guth et al. 1997, chapter 4). Previous studies of the political engagement of pastors have shown that factors in addition to theology also shape clerical activism. Broadly speaking, these factors include ministers' personal characteristics as well as the institutional and social contexts within which they live and work. For example, pastors' age (Campbell and Pettigrew 1959, 123; Guth 1984; Hailey 1988; Hoge 1976) is related to their level of political activism. Older ministers are more likely to stress evangelism and maintenance of personal morals, whereas younger ministers favor social action (Hoge 1976, 56). Similarly, interest in politics, partisanship, and ideological orientation help to shape clergy's decisions about whether and how to become engaged in political life (Guth et al. 1997).

Congregational-level variables also affect the political activity of clergy. One such variable is the physical location of the congregation in which a given minister serves. Recent research (Crawford and Olson chapter 7; Olson 1997, 2000) shows that pastors who serve in economically depressed neighborhoods are more likely to be politically active than are those who work in wealthier neighborhoods. Similarly, the rural or urban character of the congregation may also have an impact on the likelihood of political activity. So too the political homogeneity of the congregation may affect clerical activity; in congregations with relatively few deep political divisions, a minister should find it easier to make political statements, at least when those statements conform to congregational perspectives. Finally, the sheer workload level imposed on pastors affects their ability and willingness to take the time to engage in political activity (Quinley 1974, 16–17).

Given the rich variety of factors that may shape clerical activism, we now test several variables that account for the choices clergy make about activism. As we have seen, there are various modes of political participation in which ministers may engage. Here, however, we examine several aspects of clergy's choices about taking public stands on issues and becoming involved in political campaigns: (1) over the course of their careers and (2) during the 1996

TABLE 10.5. *Determinants of Reformed Clergy's Activism*

	Christian Reformed Church		Reformed Church of America	
	Career	1996	Career	1996
Theological views				
Is orthodox	−0.02	0.07	0.03	0.09
Places greater emphasis on morality	0.12	0.05	0.07	−0.04
Believes "there is one correct view"	0.14*	0.17**	0.05	0.08
Believes "clergy should cooperate"	0.13	0.09	0.17**	0.15*
Contextual factors				
Size of community	0.14*	0.04	0.12	0.04
Pastor-congregation agreement	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.05
Years at church	0.07	0.05	−0.07	−0.02
Personal factors				
Party identification	−0.09	−0.07	−0.06	0.03
Ideology	0.01	0.02	−0.07	−0.10
Level of political interest	0.29***	0.35***	0.11	0.24***
Years in ministry	0.13*	0.12	0.02	0.01
Age	0.04	0.06	0.01	−0.08
R^2	0.22	0.23	0.07	0.11

SOURCE: Compiled by authors from 1996 surveys of Reformed clergy. $N = 520$.
NOTE: $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{***}p < 0.001$.

presidential campaign. Our dependent variable is an index that incorporates whether the respondent took a public stand on a political issue; personally campaigned on behalf of a candidate; publicly endorsed a particular candidate; attempted to persuade someone to vote for a specific candidate; actively supported a candidate during the presidential primaries; and actively supported a candidate during the general election campaign. We use three broad categories of independent variables in the analysis: the theological views of the respondent, certain contextual variables tied to the respondent's ministry, and various personal factors. These variables and our results are presented in table 10.5.

The analysis reveals some marked differences between CRC and RCA clergy, both over their entire careers and in the presidential election year of 1996. The most important factor shaping campaign involvement among CRC and RCA clergy is their level of interest in politics; clergy who are more interested in politics are much more likely to become involved in campaign activities than are those with less interest in politics. But, two other variables—the need for clergy to cooperate in politics and size of community—are slightly more important than level of interest in politics for the career-long political involvement of RCA clergy.

The theological variables included in table 10.5 move CRC and RCA clergy

in the same direction, but their relative importance varies by denomination. The composite measure of theological orthodoxy has a rather weak impact in terms of political participation across the careers of the pastors surveyed. Contrary to most previous findings (Guth et al. 1997), though, greater orthodoxy is positively associated with increased participation in the 1996 election for both CRC and RCA clergy. Those clergy who are more inclined to agree that "there should be less emphasis on personal morality and more on changing society to conform to Christ's teachings" are also more likely to participate, though the political participation of RCA clergy in 1996 stands as an exception to this relationship.

Two other variables tapping social theology move CRC and RCA clergy in the same direction, though their relative importance differs. CRC clergy who agree with the statement that "on most important political issues there is only one correct view" tend to be more politically engaged. For RCA clergy, however, it was greater agreement with the statement that "clergy of different faiths need to cooperate more in politics" that was tied to greater political engagement. The relative effect of the "one correct view" variable for CRC clergy is nearly equal in magnitude to the "cooperate in politics" variable for RCA clergy both across careers and in 1996. Moreover, these social theologies rank second in relative importance in each denomination respectively, trailing only personal interest in politics in their power to explain the level of political activity among the pastors we surveyed.

With regard to contextual factors, the size of the community within which one's congregation is located has the greatest impact on clerical political engagement. Pastors who serve churches in urban settings are more likely to be politically engaged than are those serving smaller or more rural churches, especially over their careers. The relative effect of community size is roughly equivalent for CRC and RCA clergy.

When clergy perceive their political views to be the same as those of their congregations, they are more likely to be politically engaged. Such perceived convergence is positively tied to increased engagement both across careers and during the 1996 campaign, regardless of denomination. But such convergence between pastor and congregation is associated with only modest increases in political participation.

The number of years a pastor has served in a congregation is tied to increased participation for CRC clergy but not for RCA clergy. At first glance,

this finding may seem perplexing. But other modes of clerical engagement (such as preaching a whole sermon on a political issue) are likely more related to length of service than would be the case for the forms of participation tapped by our index, which is tied to more conventional forms of campaign involvement. If this is the case, then the likelihood of clergy's engagement in more conventional political activity may be more idiosyncratically related to years of service in the congregation.

Finally, as noted above, level of political interest ranks as the most important factor shaping clergy involvement in political campaigns, except in the case of career participation by RCA clergy. Democratic partisan identification leads to greater levels of political engagement by both CRC and RCA clergy with one exception: greater GOP identification led to increased participation among RCA clergy in 1996. Increased liberal ideological orientations are weakly related to increased political participation among CRC clergy, but increased conservative orientations are more strongly related to political engagement among RCA clergy.

Length of service in the ministry is moderately related to increased political engagement among CRC clergy but only weakly related to political engagement for RCA clergy. Perhaps the relationship for CRC clergy is a function of the greater likelihood that Democratic Party identifiers within their ranks engage in campaign-related activities. The common perception is that most CRC congregations have Republican partisan inclinations. Consequently, increased years in the ministry may give CRC pastors, particularly those with Democratic partisan inclinations, greater "freedom" to express views and exhibit behaviors that may be more at odds with their congregations. On the other hand, increased years in the ministry may simply enable such pastors to find congregations that are more aligned with their own political views. Increased political activity may also be a function of similar educational experiences and theological instruction as different cohorts of seminarians have passed through (primarily) Calvin Theological Seminary.

Finally, older CRC pastors are more inclined to be politically engaged. In the RCA, however, younger pastors were likely to be politically involved in the 1996 election, though age has virtually no impact on patterns of participation across the careers of RCA pastors. Thus the patterns for the CRC clergy, whether in terms of career patterns or in terms of the 1996 campaign alone, stand in contrast to the patterns for RCA clergy, particularly for the 1996 elec-

tion. Whereas CRC pastors who were more Democratic, more liberal, older, and who had served longer in the ministry were more involved in campaign activity, RCA clergy who were more Republican, more conservative, and younger were similarly involved, at least in the 1996 election campaign.

This study examines political engagement among CRC and RCA pastors both across their careers and during the 1996 presidential election. Political engagement among these clergy varies by mode of activity and theological orientation. Despite certain similarities between the CRC and RCA denominations, many patterns of clerical involvement in politics do differ between the two denominations.

Theological orthodoxy renders pastors more likely to make political pronouncements (by touching on an issue in a sermon, preaching a whole sermon on an issue, or taking a stand on a political issue on the pulpit), particularly during the 1996 election campaign. Greater orthodoxy is also related to higher levels of public endorsement of or prayer for a candidate, both over the course of clergy's careers and especially during the 1996 campaign. Clergy who exhibit higher levels of theological orthodoxy are more likely to choose to make political pronouncements than are more modernist ministers.

Theological orthodoxy is less strongly related to political engagement among the clergy we studied with respect to citizenship activities like voting in elections, contributing money to political parties or political organizations, contacting public officials, and circulating petitions. The relationship between theological orthodoxy and involvement in these citizenship activities is somewhat weaker and less consistent. Higher levels of political engagement are sometimes associated with higher levels of theological orthodoxy, but in other instances they are associated with lower levels of orthodoxy (or higher levels of modernism).

Finally, some distinct forms of political activity have been and continue to be the province of theological modernists. In particular, most efforts to form groups in the church to study social and political problems, as well as those efforts to organize action groups within the church, are done more frequently by more theologically modernist clergy.

As Guth notes in chapter 3, it is crucial to be precise about both the forms and timing of clergy's political engagement. Clergy who exhibit higher levels of theological modernism are no longer the sole, nor necessarily the stronger,

movers and shakers politically. More orthodox pastors have closed the gap with, if not surpassed, more modernist pastors in their level of political activity. This is particularly true in recent years, as evidenced by our findings about pastors' involvement in 1996. As a result, earlier findings (Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974) that theologically modernist ministers were more likely to be politically engaged may no longer accurately reflect reality. Certainly the situation today is more complex—if not reversed.

This page intentionally left blank

11 Shaping Pacifism: The Role of the Local Anabaptist Pastor

JOEL S. FETZER

A theme of this volume is that the choices clergy make about political involvement have important ramifications for the political attitudes and participation of members of their congregations. Clergy play an important role in shaping the democratic American polity. Yet in chapter 3 James Guth laments the dearth of research on "the [direct or indirect] effects that clergy have on the political process" (page 30). He further identifies the question of "whether and how clergy influence parishioners' social and political orientations" as the "most recalcitrant research problem" in clergy studies (page 41). In this chapter I hope to help fill this gap in the literature.

Although the possibility of pastoral influence is intuitively appealing and often hypothesized (Ammerman 1987, 204; Beatty and Walter 1989), surprisingly little empirical research seems to have directly tested its validity. Most previous work examines clerical influence indirectly or in artificial settings. Researchers should not assume that the local minister necessarily communicates the church hierarchy's official position to his or her congregation (Rose 1971, 266–67; see also Hamil-Luker and Smith 1998). Neither is it possible to ensure that the laboratory studies of pastoral influence (Pallone 1965, 1966; Pallone and Yeandel 1968) are externally valid or free from methodological artifacts. Surveys in actual churches are more likely to represent the "real world," but not all of them directly compare the *political* attitudes of the parishioner with those of his or her minister (Burtt and Falkenberg 1941; Johnson 1964; Price, Terry, and Johnston 1980). Laity might not always report the views or behavior of their clergy accurately (Tamney and Johnson 1985). Nor are ministers necessarily the best judges of how much influence they have (Birrell, Greer, and Roche 1979). A few scholars have interviewed congregation members and their pastors separately. But these studies either did not specifically examine the effects of clerical influence (Erickson 1992; Leege and Gremillion 1986; Mickey 1980; Murphy 1972; Nelsen and Baxter 1981) or found little evidence of it (Glock, Ringer, and Babbie 1967, 169–71; Glock and Ringer 1956;

but see Jelen 1992a; Wald 1992). Crawford's naturalistic experiment (1974) also revealed little or no persuasion effect, but that study may merely indicate that pastors need more than one or two sermons to influence their parishioners significantly.

Despite this lack of direct evidence, the broader literature on persuasion strongly suggests that clergy should be expected to have an influence on their flocks. Social psychology research has indicated that a person's success in persuading others depends on her or his credibility (perceived competence and trustworthiness), attractiveness (how much others like, are familiar with, and feel similar to the persuader), and power (the potential rewards and punishments the persuader has at his or her disposal, as well as his or her ability to observe compliance). In general, subjects are also more likely to accept a message that is repeated often and that is relatively close to their own views (McGuire 1985).

Previous research therefore indicates that local pastors—especially the Anabaptist ones studied in this chapter—are well equipped to instill their views in parishioners, at least on topics on which the clergy are considered experts. Many churchgoers believe their minister is trustworthy and competent to discuss religious and moral matters. They generally like, know, and feel similar to her or him. Pastors often take advantage of the many opportunities they have to communicate their views, either orally through sermons, prayers, and informal "fellowship," or in writing through church bulletins, tracts, and posters (see Guth et al. 1997, 162–84). Especially in more low-church, sect-type traditions, the minister sometimes "takes on the characteristic of a pope on matters of faith and life" (Welch et al. 1993; see also Jelen chapter 2). Finally, regular churchgoers are unlikely to hold religious (and perhaps even sociopolitical) premises that are radically different from those of their minister.

In order to determine if any clergy ever have any influence on their parishioners' political attitudes, I have chosen to examine North American Anabaptists' views on the morality of war. If any ministers shape their congregants' political views, it should be Mennonite and Brethren pastors in their efforts to inculcate a "peace witness." As members of the "historic peace churches," Mennonites and Brethren traditionally have taught that Christ's teachings forbid Christians from ever directly serving in the military (Hershberger 1944; Yoder 1972). The degree to which late twentieth-century Anabaptists hold to this tradition varies by denomination (Kauffman and Driedger 1991, 216, 222–

23). Yet the national leadership of even the least pacifistic groups generally acknowledges the doctrine in principle and exerts considerable effort to instill pacifist or "nonresistant" views in local pastors and congregants. Though theological conservatism seems to inhibit some non-Anabaptist clergy from speaking out on certain political issues (Jelen 1994a), religious orthodoxy appears to *strengthen* Mennonite leaders' resolve to "preach peace."

Indeed, the average Anabaptist lay person would have a hard time avoiding her church's peace message. During fieldwork in Anabaptist congregations just after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, for example, I encountered various ways in which Mennonite and Brethren pastors teach peace theology to their flocks. During his sermon, one Mennonite Church pastor criticized "[political] leaders [who] bring us to war for greed or trifles" (personal observation, March 1991), while a Church of the Brethren minister prayed, "Help us to love our enemies . . . bring peace to our neighborhood, our world" (personal observation, March 1991). Most of the Anabaptist churches I visited held an annual Peace Sunday (usually close to the Fourth of July) featuring a sermon, prayer, and litanies around the theme of nonresistance. One urban, dually aligned Mennonite Church/General Conference Mennonite Church congregation even held a special service on the eve of the Gulf War and regular anniversary services to remember the nuclear bombing of Japan. A tract on a church's literature table proclaimed, "The way of peace is the way of Jesus. The way of war is the way of men." When I visited a rural Mennonite Church congregation immediately after the cease-fire, moreover, their prominently displayed church sign read "Speak Out for Peace."

To test whether such advocacy efforts bear fruit, I examine data from a survey that directly measures pastoral and congregational views on war. These data allow us to compare the attitudes of a churchgoer with the views of his or her "real-life" minister. Furthermore, this survey was conducted in actual churches instead of in a laboratory. This study should therefore help us better understand the fourth "neglected area" (political influence) that Guth identifies in the literature on clergy in politics (see chapter 3).

Data and Model

This chapter analyzes J. Howard Kauffman's 1989 survey (Kauffman and Institute of Mennonite Studies 1989) of five Anabaptist denominations (Men-

nonite Church, General Conference Mennonite Church, Mennonite Brethren, Evangelical Mennonite, and Brethren in Christ) in the United States and Canada.[1]

To evaluate how well their theories match reality, social scientists commonly create a statistical abstraction, or *model,* to describe how the *variables,* or hypothesized causes or effects, interact with each other. This chapter posits a model containing several such variables. In order to examine whether the pastors in Kauffman's sample influence their parishioners' views on war, we must of course include a variable for the minister's degree of pacifism. In addition, the model should consider the effects of the most common background (contextual) characteristics. Persons of different genders or racial and ethnic heritages could have been socialized into divergent defense-related attitudes, just as respondents of different generations or at different stages of life may not approach the question in the same way. Disparities in expertise and occupational socialization could create varying attitudes among separate vocational groups. Respondents from the city or suburbs may tend to have a more cosmopolitan outlook than would those in more rural locales. Greater income could lead to increased support for the economic and political status quo. Conversely, the unemployed may care little about defending the established order. One may be more likely to accept the position on war professed by one's preferred political party. Increased education could make one more likely to agree with the academic elite's view of war. Since many of Kauffman's respondents attended Anabaptist schools, however, I hypothesized that education would have different effects depending on the school's affiliation. The model therefore includes a variable for having attended an Anabaptist school and an *interaction* term (a composite variable that indicates how much the strength of one variable is affected by the value of a second variable; see Jaccard, Turrisi, and Wan 1990) between length of education and type of schooling. Those respondents who did not have an Anabaptist parent may be less likely to embrace nonresistance. Finally, those who frequently attend Anabaptist churches should be more likely to oppose war than should those who attend infrequently.

Kauffman measures pacifism using questions about owning stock in defense-related companies, promoting the Anabaptists' peace position, paying the proportion of income taxes that goes for military purposes, and taking part in war or war-promoting activities. His survey also covers the draft and Israel's military dominance over the Arabs (Kauffman and Driedger 1991,

282). Responses to these questions correlate relatively highly with each other and with the resultant "pacifism scale" (an index formed by adding together all of the pacifism questions), which indicates that both Anabaptist clergy and, to a lesser extent, laity do think about war in moral terms.[2]

Both lay and ordained Anabaptist respondents vary widely in their views on the morality of war. Though all of Kauffman's respondents are official members of "historic peace churches," not all denominations or congregations hold strictly to the traditional pacifist position (Kauffman and Driedger 1991, 214–17). Pastors range from 9 to 27 on the pacifism scale, and parishioners from 5 to 27 (where 5 represents the score of someone who gave the least pacifistic answer possible to most of the questions that make up this scale, and 27 the score of someone who gave the most pacifistic response possible to most of the same items). The typical Anabaptist pastor or parishioner does oppose war, however; pastors in the sample average 20.0 on the pacifism scale, and parishioners 17.6.

Results

In order to test the validity of my model, I use various forms of *multivariate regression,* the standard statistical method for isolating the independent effect of a given variable. Without statistically controlling for the various background characteristics, one could not determine if the pastor's pacifism is really influencing his or her parishioners' views on war.

The Apparently Strong Effect of the Pastor's Views

Regression analysis suggests that a pastor's views do strongly influence those of his or her congregation.[3] According to Kauffman's data (see table 11.1), the regression coefficient (a number that shows how much one variable affects another) for the pastor's pacifism is 0.318. This coefficient indicates that the pastor's pacifism is the most powerful variable in table 11.1 and that a 1-point increase in the pastor's pacifism is associated with a 0.318-point increase in the parishioner's opposition to war. If, all else being equal, a pastor were to move from a pacifism score of 27 (highly pacifistic) to one of 17 (centrist), for example, one would expect his or her parishioners to become about 3.2 points less pacifistic (say from highly pacifistic to more moderately so). These results hold, even correcting for a host of demographic variables; in other words, the

TABLE 11.1. *Effects of Anabaptist Pastors' Pacifism and Background on Parishioners' Pacifism*

	Coefficient	Standard Error
Pastor's view		
Pastor's pacifism	0.318**	0.020
Control variables		
Education	−0.091	0.067
Mennonite education	−0.959*	0.494
Education × Mennonite education	0.371**	0.092
Democrat	0.621*	0.313
Republican	−1.481**	0.224
Independent	−0.543	0.535
Progressive Conservative	0.433	0.286
Liberal	1.263**	0.404
New Democrat	2.038**	0.471
Social Credit	−0.030	0.583
Separatist/Western Canadian Concept	−0.212	1.116
African American	0.860	1.140
Native American	0.002	0.491
Other race	2.563	2.182
Female	0.877**	0.198
Urban	0.136**	0.052
Age > 64	0.037	0.211
Age < 30	−0.171	0.233
No Mennonite parent	−0.765**	0.172
Church attendance	0.612	0.115
Income	−0.087*	0.039
Unemployed	−0.798	1.034
Student	1.603**	0.525
Farmer	1.028*	0.368
Manager	0.215	0.316
Professional	0.565*	0.262
Clerical	0.186	0.274
Operative	0.684	0.442
Service worker	0.609	0.430
Craftsperson	0.159	0.391
Laborer	0.930	0.643
Constant	8.734**	0.898

SOURCE: Compiled by author from J. Howard Kauffman's 1989 survey of five Anabaptist denominations. $N = 1701$.

NOTE: Adjusted $R^2 = 0.358$. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.001$. Estimates are based on unweighted data and obtained by ordinary least squares regression. Weighting cases by size of denomination (see Kauffman and Driedger 1991, 275–76) yielded comparable coefficients. Cases with missing values were deleted listwise. Nonresident church members were excluded from the analysis.

pastor's views influence the parishioners' views *independently* of any effects from gender, age, education, or any other factors. And since the standard error (a statistical measure of a particular part of the model's reliability) for the pastor's pacifism is relatively small, one would be hard pressed to dismiss these findings as the result of sampling variability.[4]

The Possibility of Self-Selection

Of course, cross-sectional analysis can rarely if ever prove causation. At best, it should make one strongly suspect the presence of a causal relationship. To achieve even this level of persuasiveness, however, one must demonstrate that alternative hypotheses are implausible. In contextual or social learning arguments like my own, the principal alternative hypothesis is self-selection (see also Cavendish chapter 13; Crawford and Olson chapter 7). Self-selection can take many forms. As Jelen notes in chapter 2, one self-selection hypothesis is that congregants choose pastors who agree with them politically. If such self-selection takes place, the strong correlation between the pastor's views and those of the congregation would reflect the way congregations choose their minister, not clergy influence.

If this form of self-selection occurs, however, one would expect congregations that had recently hired their pastor to agree more with him or her than would congregations that had selected their minister a long time ago. Individual congregants tend to agree strongly with newly hired pastors. In a church led for many years by the same minister, however, members of the original pastoral selection team could have long since moved on to other congregations or passed away. The apparent effect of the pastor's pacifism should thus decrease the longer she or he has served at a given church.

Fortunately, Kauffman's data allow us to test this hypothesis. If one adds a variable for the number of years the pastor has been at the church[5] and an interaction term between tenure and the pastor's pacifism to the other variables shown in table 11.1, the substantive results remain roughly the same. The estimate for the effect of the pastor's pacifism remains strong and statistically significant,[6] while the estimate for the interaction term is statistically significant and *positive.*[7] Length of tenure by itself seems to have a relatively strong independent effect.[8] These results indicate that, contrary to the self-selection hypothesis, pastors become *more* influential the longer they have served in a given parish. A highly pacifistic (score = 27) veteran pastor with thirty-eight years of service to the same church, for example, would persuade his or her flock to be 2.70 points more pacifistic than would a just-hired minister of identical views. Similarly, a nonpacifistic (score = 9) pastor of thirty-eight years would influence his or her congregation to be 3.19 points *less* pacifistic than would a first-year "rookie" minister with the same beliefs.

Another way in which self-selection could invalidate my argument is if people select a church based on the pastor's position on war (see Jelen 1992a). Yet while a few "Anabaptists by choice" certainly have done so (Hostetler 1954, 203, 207), this hypothesis explains little of the apparent effect of pastoral pacifism. Although Kauffman's protocol does not ask whether a respondent had left or joined a church because of its position on war, his data do indicate whether the respondent was raised Anabaptist and whether she or he had ever belonged to a different denomination. If someone had been raised in a particular Anabaptist denomination and had never belonged to another one, it is unlikely that she or he ever left or joined a local church because of its position on war.[9] If, to test for such self-selection, one analyzes data solely from these "lifelong Anabaptists," the estimate for the influence of the pastor's pacifism remains almost identical to that in table 11.1.[10]

Further evidence against these two self-selection hypotheses comes from using *instrumental variables* (a special form of regression; see Bowden and Turkington 1984) to correct for any two-way causation between the pastor's pacifism and the parishioner's views on war.[11] If the parishioner's views influence the pastor's views just as much as vice versa, normal regression is likely to overestimate the effect of the minister's attitudes on those of the congregants. This instrumental-variables technique, however, produces a "corrected" estimate that is *stronger* than that in table 11.1.[12] According to the new estimate, if a pastor moved from a pacifism score of 27 to 17, we would expect his or her parishioners to become less pacifistic by about *5.0* (instead of only 3.2) points.

Yet another form of self-selection could occur if parishioners modified their behavior to suit the socially favored response. One way in which this biasing mechanism could occur is if those who agreed with the war-related social norm of their church (and usually of their pastor) were more likely to complete a questionnaire than were those who disagree. The data do not support this hypothesis, however. If potential respondents were more likely to cooperate when they agreed with their pastor, the apparent effect of the pastor's views should decrease as the response rate (the percentage of parishioners in a given church who completed a questionnaire) increased. Adding the response rate and an interaction term between the response rate and the pastor's pacifism, however, produces little substantive change. The estimate for the interaction term cannot be statistically distinguished from zero,[13] and the

coefficient for response rate is also insignificant.[14] The estimate for pastoral pacifism, on the other hand, is only slightly weaker than in table 11.1.[15]

Other Alternative Explanations

Self-selection, however, is not the only kind of alternative hypothesis. My results could also be spurious if the parishioners put down what they thought their pastor or the interviewer wanted to hear instead of revealing their true beliefs. And since five avowedly pacifistic denominations officially sponsored Kauffman's survey, one should be all the more wary of bias from social desirability or interviewer effects.

Fortunately for my analysis, however, the wide variability within congregations may mean that such effects were small. That so many people did disagree significantly with their pastor indicates that few had compunctions about doing so. Hartmann's study (1941) of pacifist motivation, moreover, shows that many respondents will continue to disagree with authority figures on the question despite facing sanctions more severe than most churchgoers would encounter. And since Kauffman conducted his survey anonymously (Kauffman and Harder 1989, 2), "deviant" Anabaptists presumably had little cause to fear being disfellowshipped.

One might also contend that my results merely reflect the pastor's adaptation to his or her congregation (see Glock and Ringer 1956; for a related phenomenon, see Crawford and Olson chapter 7). Thus pastors might change their views to match those of their "employers" (the congregation). It seems much more intuitive, however, to suppose that the pastor's views would influence the congregation's rather than vice versa. My previous use of instrumental variables should have corrected not only for self-selection but also for any such pastoral adaptation. Hadden's study (1969, 86–88; but see Quinley 1974, 248–57), moreover, indicates that laity do not affect the political *beliefs* of the clergy. (*Behavior* is another story; see Jelen chapter 2; Campbell and Pettigrew 1959; Crawford 1974; Quinley 1974, 209–34.)

Finally, critics might claim that my results are spurious reflections of regional context, or milieu. Pastors and their parishioners would, according to this view, hold similar attitudes because almost everyone in a given region thinks alike. Limiting the sample to the nonurban northern half of a major midwestern state also fails to support this claim. Data from this region do not demonstrate consensus among either the clergy[16] or the congregants.[17] Nor

does regression analysis show much change.[18] Yet even if all laity and clergy in a certain region did agree, my hypothesis could still remain untouched. I could then argue that the like-minded clergy were all instilling the same attitudes into their parishioners.

The above analysis has shown that the apparent effect of pastoral persuasion remains even after considering the chief alternative hypotheses. The results stay about the same when one allows congregations the freedom to choose like-minded pastors. Apparent persuasion effects also persist if parishioners are permitted to select a church based on the pastor's view of war. Few respondents seem to have modified their behavior because of social desirability. The views of the congregation do not seem to have affected the *attitudes* of the clergy, but even allowing for this possibility leaves the results substantially unchanged. Finally, these findings do not seem to be merely a spurious reflection of regional context or milieu.

Yet even if pastors do influence their parishioners' *moral* attitudes, these views do not always imply an identical *political* orientation.[19] Whether an Anabaptist translates moral convictions about *war* into political terms may depend on how strongly she or he holds to a "two-kingdoms ethic" (Kauffman and Harder 1975, 132–34). Hurwitz and Peffley (1987; see also Brunk, Secrest, and Tamashiro 1996, 192–95) have nevertheless demonstrated the strong linkage between one's defense-related "core values" (such as pacifism) and "preferences for specific foreign-policy issues" (such as U.S. military involvement in Central America).

Indeed, North American Anabaptists have grown increasingly comfortable with translating their moral abhorrence of war into specifically political actions. The Mennonite Central Committee maintains lobbying offices in Washington and Ottawa to advocate peaceful solutions to international conflicts (Graber Miller 1996, 1–78). Along with the Friends, or Quakers, U.S. Mennonites loudly protested America's military actions in Vietnam and the Persian Gulf (DeBenedetti 1990, 345; Hall 1992; Shenk 1991). Mennonites have committed such acts of civil disobedience as praying in the Capitol rotunda and blockading a nuclear weapons factory (Ruth-Heffelbower 1991, 44–50). Some of the most radical Anabaptists have even refused to pay "war taxes" to the U.S. government, resulting in IRS seizure of their bank accounts (Peachey 1993). Others have participated in Christian Peacemaker Teams overseas, try-

ing, for example, to stop Israeli forces from blocking access to Hebron University (Lynch 1997) and from bulldozing Palestinians' homes in the West Bank (Kern 1998; Klassen 1998).

If my analysis is correct, it also indicates that Anabaptists have not squandered the considerable economic and theological resources they have invested in helping their pastors teach peace.[20] Anabaptist laity do appear to be taking Peace Sunday sermons and similar messages to heart. Continued pastoral leadership could prove one of the most effective ways of maintaining the peace witness that most other denominations have abandoned in their transition from marginalized sect to respectable church (Hughes 1996, 1–8, 137–67, 258–63).

12 Cardinal O'Connor and His Constituents: Differential Benefits and Public Evaluations

PAUL A. DJUPE

The political arena has seldom been reserved solely for politicians. It has also often included the voices and deeds of people concerned with politicians' actions. Officeholders and religious leaders, for example, have often clashed over issues such as the threat of nuclear war, social justice, prayer in school, and abortion. In chapter 2, Jelen discusses the key role of resources in shaping the political choices made by religious leaders. One of the primary challenges that religious leaders face in developing their public role is whether they have the latitude to make pronouncements in the political sphere—especially statements that may conflict with the views of their parishioners—without endangering support for themselves or the institutions they represent. Many studies of clergy in politics focus on their effectiveness and influence (see Jelen chapter 2; Guth chapter 3). This chapter, however, deals with the potential effect of clergy political activity on their public support. I discuss the nature of the "benefit exchange" between New York City Catholics and the late John Cardinal O'Connor to explain the level of parishioners' public support for the cardinal's actions.

Public support for religious leaders is important because it can grant the leader some autonomy to address issues of concern publicly and perhaps prophetically. The cascading effects of public speech by religious leaders like Cardinal O'Connor are many, including shifting the opinion and values of parish members and inspiring parish clergy and parishioners to take public action.

A theory of public support for religious leaders would seem to depend on a "benefit exchange" between leader and follower (Salisbury 1992). In essence, followers who are pleased with the spiritual and political benefits they receive will grant their leader support—and allow the leader to pursue political goals

(Olson 1965). There may have been a time in American history when it seemed odd to ask whether religious leaders enjoyed public support, particularly in the context of the Catholic Church. Many recent accounts, however, argue that public support for the actions and statements of the Catholic hierarchy is no longer constant or predictable. Analysis of public approval of the cardinal, therefore, provides some insight into how Catholics evaluate their religious leaders.

In order to understand the linkages among political benefits, spiritual benefits, and political agreement, it is important to understand the context of the Catholic Church in 1990. In the 1950s, one would not think of asking about the effect of clergy political activity on parishioners; their support was just assumed. Since that time, however, Catholic parishioners' freedom to make their own religious choices has increased substantially in the United States (Djupe 2000). This is important because without parishioner choice, the leadership has free reign with regard to their political activity. Before the Second Vatican Council (1962–65), significant social, but especially spiritual, costs were associated with leaving the Church (Hertzke 1988, 147). After Vatican II, not only were Catholics able to leave the Church without serious spiritual consequences, they were also granted an enhanced ability to voice their concerns within the Church (Appleby 1997). Thus Vatican II gave parishioners an enhanced opportunity to choose between exit, voice, and loyalty (Hirschman 1970). This ability to choose entails a significant change in the nature of the relationship between parishioners and hierarchy; consequences are now based on the effectiveness of the exchange between leader and follower. When parishioners have more freedom to choose to associate and contribute, the leadership must acknowledge and consider the nature of the exchange they provide to members at the peril of institutional integrity.

Before Vatican II the power and voice of the Catholic hierarchy was firmly established in the United States. By the 1920s Rome had subdued and integrated the various national churches. It had also overcome the democratizing trend of the American religious environment, mainly through the mass immigration of hierarchical Catholics from Europe in the early 1800s (Dolan 1992). Vatican II, however, dramatically changed the rules by which most Catholics had previously lived. It considerably liberalized the Church's religious practices in order to realize Pope John XXIII's goal of *aggiornamento,* or bringing the Church "up to date" (Dolan 1992, 424). Suddenly the Church

ended the practice of meatless Fridays. It loosened the consequences of missing weekly mass. It took steps toward more inclusion of laity in local Church affairs. And churches turned their altars around to face the parishioners, which was such a dramatic change that some lapsed Catholics returning to the post–Vatican II Church did not even recognize it (Greeley 1977). Vatican II weakened some of the power of the hierarchy by giving the laity a stronger role in affairs that were once closed to them, supplying the new participants with a sense of efficacy. In fact, the promotion of lay inclusion weakened the bishops' authority to govern their dioceses (Reichley 1985, 290). In a potent phrase, Dolan suggests that Vatican II offered Catholics the *authority* to dissent (1992, 426), an ability that proved quite controversial (Kelly 1982).

These changes in the Church are reflected in attitudes toward its hierarchy after Vatican II. Two National Opinion Research Center studies in 1963 (during the council) and 1973 (after it was over) asked Catholics specific questions regarding their evaluations of Catholic religious elites. By 1973 only 42 percent of Catholics believed Jesus handed control of the Church directly to Peter and the popes, down from 70 percent in 1963. Further, by 1973 only 32 percent believed that the pope was infallible when speaking on faith and moral issues (Greeley 1977, 128).

Data

To investigate public support for Cardinal O'Connor, I analyze data from a WABC/*New York Daily News* survey of New York City residents conducted in April 1990, which was designed specifically to capture public attitudes about Cardinal O'Connor and the Roman Catholic Church.[1] The survey was administered to a sample of 521 Catholics, some of whom were raised Catholic and later dropped out (14.4 percent), some of whom converted in adulthood (3.7 percent). The majority of the sample, however, comprised lifelong Catholics (82 percent). I refer to those who dropped out as "lapsed Catholics," and converts and lifelong Catholics as "current Catholics." The survey combined questions about approval of O'Connor's job performance with questions on personal stances on social issues, religious and political attachments, and demographic characteristics.

A Theory of Support for Religious Leaders

Organizations meet many needs for individuals. They allow people to express political concerns, accomplish political goals, fulfill social needs, and receive material benefits (Salisbury 1992; Clark and Wilson 1961). Religious institutions add the further function of providing spiritual benefits, for which there is a potent and widespread desire in a country where over 90 percent of the populace believes in God (Wald 1997). Religious institutions provide religious benefits to followers in exchange for some form of support (Salisbury 1992) such as money, loyalty, or time and talent. This entrepreneurial spirit was especially evident in the religious market in the early 1800s when new religions sprang up and used new mixes of benefits to attract new followers (Finke and Stark 1992). New religions that focused on meeting followers' spiritual needs but also delivered on the myriad other needs of early American society were best situated to grow (Iannaccone 1994). Today's megachurch is perhaps the best modern example of a religious firm adapting to meet the spiritual, health, social, childcare, and many other needs of members.

To maintain themselves, membership organizations (like religious institutions) depend on member satisfaction with the benefits they offer (Olson 1965; Salisbury 1992; Clark and Wilson 1961). This matter of maintenance depends largely on the leader's ability to provide some measure of expressive or purposive benefits, which are two of the primary reasons people join groups. Leaders confer expressive benefits when they articulate the opinions of the group's members in a public setting. Leaders confer purposive benefits when they accomplish the group's political goals. Leaders are often constrained by members to articulate positions only on those issues with which the membership is in substantial agreement. But successful maintenance through the provision of these and other benefits may provide the leader room to maneuver in the political process (Olson 1965). That is, he may be able to make public statements or pursue policies of his own concern, irrespective of the views of the membership. This ability is often rather limited and is used at some risk to the organization, though. Leaders in nonpolitical groups such as the Catholic Church, or groups with a narrow political focus, may enjoy more latitude in issue areas that are *not* the primary concern of the organization.

Religious organizations are not explicitly political organizations, but they

often have significant political effect by pushing for change (Findlay 1993; Fowler, Hertzke, and Olson 1999; Gusfield 1963; Morris 1984; Wald 1997). Speaking out for change, however, can have costs as well as benefits. The Catholic Church's official statements on the controversial issues of birth control and abortion have led to widespread dissension within the ranks and significant drops in membership (Greeley 1977). Overt participation by mainline Protestant clergy in the civil rights movement led to intense conflict within the churches, a period of retreat from the political sphere, and membership losses (Hadden 1969; Quinley 1974; Roof and McKinney 1987). On the other hand, as Sawyer shows in chapter 5, participation by African American clergy in the civil rights movement built support within African American churches and communities (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Morris 1984). A similar story could be told about many white evangelical clergy and their political actions surrounding abortion and other issues (Guth et al. 1997; Wald 1997). This brief discussion begs two questions: (1) What is the nature of the benefit exchange in religious organizations? (2) How do the political choices that clergy make affect that benefit exchange and hence member support? We can collapse the mix of benefits that religious organizations provide that relate to political action by clergy into two broad categories: religious benefits and political benefits.

Religious benefits are forms of spiritual satisfaction derived from the parish environment, including quality of the worship service, availability of pastoral counseling, and amount of focus on members. Even though Cardinal O'Connor had no direct presence in most of the New York City area's parishes, he was nevertheless involved in the provision of religious benefits. He provided direct spiritual benefits when he publicly articulated Catholic beliefs in the media, in mass, or in another public forum. He also provided religious benefits indirectly by supporting the activities of parish clergy through the budget, appointments, and other services. His successful maintenance of the membership, finances, education, and buildings of the New York Archdiocese might also qualify as religious benefits.

Political benefits flow from support for the leadership's political positions and activities on issues such as abortion, premarital sex, land use, and environmental racism. The political benefit exchange may turn primarily, but not solely, on agreement with the leadership's policy positions. It also includes parishioners' expectations of the political role of their religious leaders. Reli-

gious leaders and organizations often take public stands on political issues. They also commit organizational resources toward political efforts, such as when mainline Protestant churches offered facilities to train students for the Freedom Summer (Findlay 1993), or when the Catholic Church commits parish resources to the pro-life movement (National Conference of Catholic Bishops 1975). Cardinal O'Connor, for instance, started an order of nuns whose sole goal was to oppose abortion (Brozan 1989), and he spoke out against Catholic elected officials who adopted pro-choice stands (Goldman 1990; Verhovek 1990). Some parishioners are in favor of their clergy taking explicit political action beyond mere position taking, but many others disapprove. A 1996 Pew study demonstrates the considerable variation between religious traditions in support for church politicking: 70 percent of evangelical Protestants, 67 percent of African American Christians, 50 percent of white Catholics, and 48 percent of mainline Protestants support their clergy expressing their political views.

These two kinds of benefits are not independent of each other. Satisfaction with spiritual and political benefits overlaps in complex ways. There are obvious incongruities for members who support the spiritual views of a leader who expresses policy stands they find disagreeable. Dissatisfaction with clergy's policy stances can weaken spiritual contentment, though it is certainly possible that contentment with the provision of spiritual benefits can overwhelm disagreement with political action. If political benefits are not important for members, yet religious benefits are important, then leaders will be granted wide latitude in making political pronouncements as long as they properly maintain the spiritual side of the organization.

How far can religious elites stray politically from the views of the flock without losing support and membership? The question would seem to turn on member satisfaction with the nature of the exchange with their religious leaders. Each religious tradition offers a different benefit package, especially with regard to desired and actual political action. Presumably in a society where people increasingly shop for their churches even across religious traditions (Schaller 1990), members find places of worship that fit their conception of what benefit exchange a congregation and denomination should offer.

The consequences of clergy's political activity may be evaluated by considering the two components of the benefit exchange and their relative weights. To focus on political benefits, I hold the spiritual benefits constant. When po-

litical agreement and desire for political benefits are low, clergy have some room to pursue a political agenda as a by-product because members may not care about or even notice the leader's activities. If clergy overstep the political bounds of disagreement too often, there may be a backlash. Members may leave, reduce their contributions, or speak out in protest. Cardinal O'Connor and the Catholic Church fit this scenario. The Church experienced precisely this dynamic after releasing its statement on the family in 1968 (Greeley 1977), and it continues to face a divided membership over issues of sexuality (birth control, premarital sex, and divorce) and life (abortion and capital punishment). But Catholics' low desire for political benefits means that O'Connor was able to pursue political goals as a by-product of success in providing spiritual goods.

The WABC polling data provide further evidence to support this analysis of O'Connor and the Catholic Church. Catholics who have left the Church may have done so as the result of many factors, including disagreement over its policy stands. One might assume that lapsed Catholics would be more likely to disagree with the hierarchy's policy stands than would those who remained. But lapsed Catholics take statistically similar positions to current Catholics on three highly charged political issues: abortion (60.1 versus 62.7 percent respectively), homosexuality (41.9 versus 39.4 percent), and premarital sex (63.9 versus 67.4 percent). Nevertheless, the two groups must have different desired benefit exchanges. Current Catholics overwhelmingly approved of O'Connor's policies (64.5 percent) and his job (72.1 percent), but few lapsed Catholics agreed (38.5 percent policy approval and 46.9 percent job approval)—despite the fact that the two groups had similar political positions. It may be that current Catholics evaluated the cardinal's policies on other political issues that were not often mentioned in the press, such as land use, labor unions, and education.

I argue, however, that current Catholics are satisfied with the Church's provision of spiritual benefits and thus evaluated O'Connor's job based on this exchange; as a result they judged his policy stands less harshly. Among lapsed Catholics, on the other hand, either O'Connor had pushed beyond their political tolerance or they were disappointed with the spiritual exchange. Thus the lapsed gave lower job approval and harsher evaluations of O'Connor's policies. It is clear that there are significant differences in how these two groups connected their specific political disagreements with their evaluations

of Cardinal O'Connor, and that the nature of the exchange drove their evaluations more than policy disagreement.

When parishioners' focus on political benefits is high and agreement is low, clergy will either remain politically inactive or pursue activities that are relatively invisible to members. In this case, political action by clergy may fracture the congregation, so clergy naturally avoid political action and statements to maintain the integrity of the institution. Some mainline Protestant denominations fit into this scenario. United Methodists, especially, have been rocked by discussion of racial justice issues that have threatened their unity. On the other hand, prophetic action by clergy can move members toward agreement and unity given the right conditions (see Jelen's discussion of conversion in chapter 2).

Some clergy work in a context in which the demand for political action is low and political agreement is high. They may undertake political action with relatively little risk since there is little disagreement to hinder their efforts. But the lack of desire for political benefits may be a purposeful choice. Some churches eschew involvement with the world, including politics, despite basic agreement on how the world should work. Evangelicals, especially before the rise of the conservative Christian movement, best exemplify this approach. Over time political action by clergy may serve to mobilize members and create political interest, moving members into a different political context. On the other hand, clergy's political action may cause a backlash that stifles their efforts.

Lastly, high-profile religious groups that are united on matters of government and society expect considerable political action from the clergy. Hertzke (1993) finds that certain African American and Pentecostal churches formed the basis for the candidacies of Jesse Jackson and Pat Robertson, respectively, in 1988. This is consistent with the Pew study's (1996) finding of high support for political activity within these religious traditions. While evangelicals and African Americans best fit this state of high political involvement (see Guth chapter 9; Sawyer chapter 5), churches in other traditions may also support high political involvement depending on local context (Crawford and Olson chapter 7; Djupe and Gilbert 1999; Olson 1997).

But the provision of spiritual benefits is clearly not constant. It is highly variable and may be interrelated with the desire for political benefits. Political activity can focus clergy's attention away from religious activity and to-

ward worldly matters. Member demand for spiritual benefits can then cause clergy to refocus on spiritual benefits and turn away from the political process. Mainline Protestant clergy provide the prime example of this cycle (Hadden 1969; Roof and McKinney 1987). Alternatively, member satisfaction with spiritual benefits may enable clergy to undertake political activity either as an integral part of the process of providing spiritual goods, or as a by-product.

At this point I must distinguish between denominational leadership and parochial clergy since the dynamics of support for each differ. First, the possibility of member exit is less likely in the case of a lack of support for denominational leaders like the cardinal. If the parishioner is unsatisfied with the mix of benefits provided by the local clergy, she may find another church to attend that offers a more satisfactory exchange. On the other hand, we might think it unreasonable, costly, and drastic for a parishioner to leave the Catholic Church upon finding the exchange from O'Connor unsatisfactory. Apostasy, or disaffiliation, is perhaps a cheaper middle option (Bromley 1988). Second, the parishioner may expect a different exchange from parish clergy than from a denominational leader. He may expect more political benefits from the cardinal and more spiritual benefits from the local clergy. This distinction is perhaps more likely to hold true in a hierarchically organized denomination like the Catholic Church. But even Catholic parish priests are expected by the membership occasionally to become politically involved in opposition to the stances of regional and national denominational leaders (Campbell and Pettigrew 1959; McGreevy 1996). Third, the parishioner may find it easier to shrink from support of a denominational leader since the connection is indirect and loose. So parishioners are more likely to reveal their true preferences regarding O'Connor, whereas they may hide their disfavor of parish clergy because of the costs of cognitive dissonance, the costs of making such disfavor known, or the costs of leaving the congregation (see Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter 1956).

Cardinal O'Connor and the Catholic Church

I focus on the dynamics of support for John Cardinal O'Connor of New York City, partly because there are data on his Catholic constituents but mostly because he made many public and political pronouncements. The year 1990 was a particularly active one for Cardinal O'Connor. He was featured

prominently in 21 stories in *The New York Times* that year, compared with 16 stories in 1989, 8 in 1991, 14 in 1992, and 10 in 1993. His public exposure clearly climaxed in early 1990 when he criticized New York governor Mario Cuomo for his pro-choice stance on abortion (Verhovek 1990). Several months after leveling this criticism, O'Connor threatened all political leaders holding anti-Church positions with excommunication (Goldman 1990). Despite moderating this latter stance within a few days, several national papers picked up the story. The national coverage prompted O'Connor (1990) to issue a rebuttal and *The New York Times* to run a prominent story about Catholics who complained that the cardinal's own positions were being taken as the Church hierarchy's official teachings (*New York Times* Editor 1990).

Respondents in the WABC/*New York Daily News* poll were asked whether they approved or disapproved of the way the cardinal was handling his job (coded 1 = approval, 0 = disapproval).[2] This was a broad question since O'Connor's job incorporated political goals along with the primary goals of the New York Archdiocese, such as institutional maintenance and providing for the needs of the community. Thus the question tapped issues that were likely to involve spiritual benefits. Approval might be based on whether the respondent agreed with the cardinal over the choice of a parish priest or the amount of money taken from the parish's coffers. Because of O'Connor's highly visible public stands on politics, political policy considerations might weigh in as well. In this sample, 68.7 percent of all New York Catholics approved of his job performance as head of the archdiocese. Meanwhile, 61 percent of the sample were pro-choice and 87 percent believed birth control is acceptable, which means that issue positions may not have been determinative factors in support for O'Connor's job performance.

The political nature of the exchange is well represented in the survey questions concerning only sexual issues, which may not cover the full range of issues parishioners use to evaluate the cardinal. Without considering the full nature of the benefit exchange, one would still suspect that those who disagreed with O'Connor's positions on these charged issues, especially abortion, would find reason to disapprove of his policies in general and perhaps his job performance. According to the exchange theory, however, only those who found the political aspect of the exchange important *and* disagreed would disapprove of the cardinal's performance. Thus disagreement on the policy issues of abortion, homosexuality, the use of birth control by married women, and

premarital sex should not automatically trigger disapproval. Rather, the degree to which the parishioner *expects* a political benefit exchange coupled with the *quality* of that exchange matters significantly.

Respondents were asked how much political guidance they took from O'Connor. Those who felt they took a good amount (13.2 percent) or a great deal (11.5 percent) of guidance from the cardinal (people who received political benefits from him) no doubt had more positive feelings about him. It is important to note that this question was not wholly independent of policy agreement since it was (for instance) strongly correlated with agreement with O'Connor on the abortion issue.

The survey asked if the cardinal or then-Governor Mario Cuomo better represented the respondent's views on moral and religious issues. This question, of course, was asked in response to O'Connor's attack on Cuomo's pro-choice stance and Cuomo's subsequent explanation of his stance. The question again represented policy congruence with the cardinal and was correlated strongly with parishioners' stances on abortion and homosexuality.

Approximately 62 percent of New York City Catholics wanted O'Connor to "stay out of politics entirely even if he feels strongly about certain political issues." One would assume that those who disagreed with the cardinal's policies would want him out of politics. It is interesting to note that while 65 percent of people with pro-choice leanings concluded he should stay out of politics, 49 percent of people leaning pro-life felt similarly (the two variables correlate weakly at $r = 0.102$). Moreover, 54 percent of the sample felt that O'Connor's political views were too extreme. Lapsed Catholics were more likely to hold this view (73 percent) than current Catholics (51 percent); recall that these two groups do not differ significantly in their political views. Both of these variables indicate that some parishioners did *not* desire political goods to the extent that O'Connor offered them—even though they might *agree* with his positions.

Catholic respondents were asked whether O'Connor was more their moral guide than their parish priest; agreeing with this notion (which only 18 percent did) signaled that the respondent desired a mix of benefits from the cardinal emphasizing spiritual benefits. This variable was modestly correlated with the desire to see O'Connor stay out of politics ($r = 0.169$), which again suggests less desire for political benefits.

Aside from a standard set of controls (such as sex, education, and age), I

include two additional controls in my model. First is the question of whether O'Connor's actions made the respondent proud to be a Catholic (54 percent said yes). Second is whether the respondent supported the creation of an independent American Catholic Church, a question that measured support for the existing Church structure (58 percent favored an independent Catholic Church). While "proud Catholics" were more likely to approve of O'Connor's job performance, it may not be obvious how the independent Church variable related to the benefit exchange. I propose that parishioners who were satisfied with the current exchange would want to maintain the structure of the Church that delivered the benefits they enjoyed. Those favoring a split with Rome might have a desire to distance themselves from the Church hierarchy without having to take the drastic step of apostasy, or leaving the Church. Therefore opposition to an independent American Church indicated satisfaction with the current exchange and would yield positive evaluations of O'Connor.

Analysis of O'Connor's Job Approval

Table 12.1 displays the results of logistic regression for approval of the cardinal's job as head of the New York Archdiocese. In logistic regression, the coefficients—which show the estimated magnitude of the relationship between the independent variables (such as age) and dependent variables (job approval)—are not directly interpretable. Instead, one should look at the direction of the relationship, which is either positive or negative depending on the sign on the coefficient. The sign of the coefficient tells us what contributes to support (positive) and what detracts from it (negative). The significance level, which is indicated by the asterisks, indicates a very low probability that the relationship for all Catholics in the New York City area is nonexistent given the relationship found in the sample. For example, the estimated results for age show that older Catholics were less likely (negative sign) to approve of O'Connor's job.

One would expect explanatory factors of O'Connor's job approval to be less overtly political, as his job encompassed a variety of tasks other than taking political stands. Evaluation of his job brings to mind the strength of the New York Archdiocese in terms of members, money, and priests, a notion that is backed up by my results, which show that broader, less overtly political variables predicted approval of O'Connor's job performance.

TABLE 12.1. *Effects of Parishioner Benefit Evaluations and Political Agreement on Approval of John Cardinal O'Connor's Job Performance*

	Coefficient	Standard Error
Position on abortion	0.104	0.148
Position on homosexuality	−0.393	0.362
Position on birth control	0.195	0.594
Position on sex out of wedlock	0.413	0.412
"O'Connor should stay out of politics"	0.132	0.342
"O'Connor is a guide on issues"	0.081	0.101
"O'Connor is moral guide, not Cuomo"	0.318***	0.094
"O'Connor's views are about right"	1.086***	0.377
"O'Connor is moral guide, not priest"	0.315**	0.132
Opposed to independent American Catholic Church	0.696**	0.322
Lapsed Catholic	−0.796	0.514
Proud of O'Connor	2.328***	0.378
Partisanship	−0.135	0.099
Age	−0.294*	0.169
Race	−0.212	0.360
Sex	0.342	0.336
Income	0.134	0.134
Education	0.228	0.155
Constant	−3.506	1.119

SOURCE: WABC/*New York Daily News* Cardinal O'Connor Poll, April 1990. $N = 347$.
NOTE: $^{*}p < 0.10$; $^{**}p < 0.05$; $^{***}p < 0.01$.

Respondents who took pride in O'Connor's actions and disfavored changing the Church's structure were more likely to be satisfied with the benefits flowing from O'Connor and consequently expressed approval of his job performance. Though both of these views might have had political attributes, neither was explicitly political. Instead both captured overall orientations toward the benefit exchange with the cardinal. Viewing O'Connor as one's moral guide, rather than the local priest or Governor Cuomo, brought more job approval of O'Connor and indicated satisfaction with the exchange package (and some policy agreement). Lapsed Catholics were less likely to support O'Connor, though statistical confidence in the relationship was somewhat weak ($p = 0.122$).

These variables are limited in their ability to disentangle the relative contributions of satisfaction with spiritual and political benefits. But the statistical significance of having pride in O'Connor, seeing O'Connor as one's moral guide, and opposing an independent American Church—as well as the lack of significance of *any* policy position—may well mean that New York City area Catholics desired a benefit exchange heavily geared toward spiritual ben-

efits. As long as they were getting these spiritual benefits, Catholic New Yorkers would also tolerate leaders who provided unwanted political actions and policy positions. Specific disagreement with O'Connor's policies does not explain the process of granting him job approval; note that none of the four policy variables (abortion, homosexuality, birth control, and sex out of wedlock) even came close to attaining significance. Instead, even people who disagreed politically with Cardinal O'Connor granted him support.

Of the demographic controls, the only clear trend is that older Catholics disapproved of the cardinal more often than did younger parishioners, which means that older Catholics may have had a different set of benefit expectations. Respondents over 45 years old were 11 points more likely to want O'Connor out of politics than respondents under 45 (69 percent to 58 percent), despite the fact that the older Catholics were more pro-life and more likely to find O'Connor's political views acceptable.

In this chapter, I present a theory of support for religious leaders that depends on the benefit exchange that members desire from their leaders. Leaders can generate support by supplying members with the desired mix of spiritual and political benefits. By and large, different religious traditions offer different benefit packages; some are the result of the evolution of tradition and institutional history while others, like megachurches, are specifically formulated to attract a particular constituency (Towns 1990).

It is clear that John Cardinal O'Connor's constituency considers spiritual benefits more than political benefits in evaluating their approval of his job performance. Had O'Connor increased his political presence significantly or neglected the Catholic spiritual community, he would clearly have sown the seeds of a backlash, as evidenced by the high level of disagreement expressed by Catholic respondents over important policy issues. The striking differences between how lapsed and current Catholics connected their policy disagreements to approval of the cardinal show that this dynamic was at work. It is clear that in the later years of his tenure as archbishop of New York, Cardinal O'Connor enjoyed the support of his constituents, regardless of his public presence in New York City and national politics. The outpouring of grief that attended his 2000 death is a testimony to the support O'Connor enjoyed in New York.

A portion of O'Connor's constituency was spurred into political action,

primarily surrounding abortion, because of their agreement with his political and social issue stances. On the other hand, O'Connor was not effectively able to reach the larger portion of his constituency, who both disagreed with his policies and did not look to him for political mobilization. All told, the impact religious elites may have on their constituencies is determined largely by the context within which they take action. The reach of Catholic bishops is limited to an agreeable constituency that expects to receive political cues. Depending on the issue, this reach can be quite large and have a significant effect on American politics.

13 To March or Not to March: Clergy Mobilization Strategies and Grassroots Antidrug Activism

JAMES C. CAVENDISH

> You could go into Mississippi and tell people they needed to get themselves together and get organized. And that didn't make much sense. But if you started preaching to them about dry bones rising again, everybody had sung about dry bones. Everybody knew that language.
>
> —ANDREW YOUNG, in reference to the civil rights movement. Cited in Charles V. Hamilton *The Black Preacher in America* (1972)

Recently there has been great interest among intellectuals in the social action programs of inner-city churches (see Chaves and Higgins 1992; Freedman 1993; National Task Force on African-American Men and Boys 1996; Sawyer 1994). But few (if any) researchers have delved beneath the descriptive level of analysis to examine the strategies clergy in these contexts use to generate and sustain their parishioners' participation in social action programs. Part of the reason for this deficiency in the literature may be the more general difficulty, described by Jelen and Guth in chapters 2 and 3, of measuring the effects of clergy action on the political behaviors of their parishioners. It is difficult for researchers not only to assess the direction of causality in clergy-laity socialization (a difficulty that stems largely from the possibility of self-selection by the laity) but also to separate the influence of clergy from the influence of numerous other agents of socialization inside and outside the church. With so many agents influencing the political action of churchgoers, it is no wonder that researchers have not been completely successful in assessing the political consequences of clergy action in politics.

Yet understanding how clergy strategies influence the political attitudes and behaviors of churchgoers is extremely important. Such an understanding

can shed light on the ability of clergy to foster citizen formation among groups of people who are often demoralized about the problems pervading their communities and pessimistic about the ability of public institutions to solve them. This, after all, is one of the most important dynamics currently taking place in churches throughout this country, especially in churches located in the inner city.

This chapter examines the effect of clergy mobilization strategies on grassroots activism in the inner city through a participant observation study of a church on the south side of Chicago, St. Sabina Catholic Church. In this church, Rev. Michael Pfleger (or "Father Mike," as he is commonly called) uses his sermons at the 11:15 A.M. Sunday mass to encourage participation in weekly antidrug marches by providing churchgoers with a strong rationale for participation. Father Mike does not simply present simple appeals or invitations to the marches. Instead, he uses his sermons to enhance his parishioners' sense of political efficacy, to redefine their membership in the church to include active participation in its antidrug marches, and to interpret the marches in a way that resonates with the values and identity of his congregation. Thus Pfleger not only intensifies many of the deeply held convictions of his parishioners (a role that Jelen describes in chapter 2 as "reinforcement"), but he empowers them to *act* by mobilizing them for the church's antidrug campaigns.

Several research methods help to illustrate Father Mike's political mobilization strategies and the effects they have on generating and sustaining participation in the antidrug marches. I rely primarily on data gathered from 104 in-depth, mostly face-to-face interviews with church members and other participants in the weekly antidrug marches. The interview data allow me to see whether parishioners who are most exposed to Father Mike's preaching (those who attend the 11:15 A.M. mass) are more likely to share Father Mike's attitudes about the purpose and importance of these marches. I am also able to assess whether people who attend the 11:15 A.M. mass are consequently more likely to participate in the marches. My interviews are supplemented with field notes from observation of the Sunday religious services, transcripts from the Sunday homilies, informal interviews with a variety of church leaders, and newspaper articles describing the church's activism from 1989 to 1996.

St. Sabina Catholic Parish and Father Michael Pfleger

St. Sabina, established in 1916 to serve a predominantly Irish congregation, is located in the heart of Chicago's south side. It retained this Irish character until the 1960s, when the influx of African American migrants and the riots following Martin Luther King's assassination in 1968 spurred many of its white families to relocate outside of St. Sabina's parish boundaries. Within a short period of time, the neighborhood surrounding the parish changed from predominantly Irish to predominantly black, and parish membership declined dramatically. (For detailed accounts of this transition, see Cavendish 1997; McMahon 1995.)

By the mid-1970s, St. Sabina began to respond to these changing demographics. At that time, a young and dynamic priest named Rev. Michael Pfleger arrived at the parish to serve as associate pastor. Within a short period of time, Father Mike's popularity with the congregation won him the respect of the broader community. He was soon appointed pastor and began to make changes in the parish's programs and liturgies (such as introducing various African cultural traditions, a gospel choir, and liturgical dancers) that ultimately revitalized the parish by attracting members of the African American community. Father Mike's initiatives in the parish were not limited to liturgical innovations, however. Because of his longtime interest in social justice and racial equality, Father Mike soon began to seek ways for his congregation to take a stand against the growing problems of homelessness, drug abuse, violence, and alcoholism that plagued the parish's community.

To understand Father Mike's activist orientation, one needs only to look at his upbringing in an all-white neighborhood on Chicago's southwest side. Father Mike was one of two children in an Irish-German working-class family, and as a child his outlook on life was not unlike that of his peers. But, when Father Mike was in junior high school, he had a powerful experience that he identifies as a significant event in forming his vision of social outreach. This event was Martin Luther King's visit to Chicago's Marquette Park, during which Pfleger witnessed firsthand the antiblack violence of some of his neighbors and friends. As Pfleger describes the event: "I saw something there that changed my whole life. I saw people in the crowd that I knew screamin' things, and yellin' things, and throwin' rocks. I never saw people like this, saw them

like this before. Then I saw Dr. King. Here was this man walking in this park with all those people screamin' and yellin' and hollerin'—and he was in control. And I said 'What is it about this man?' And I started to read everything I could read on Martin Luther King and I think that was the turning point, of saying 'I want to do that'" (television interview on *Day One,* "Profile: Holy Warrior," ABC-TV, 31 January 1994). Clearly this event had a profound influence on Pfleger's thinking, and he began to assume what Jelen (in chapter 2) calls a Social Gospel outlook on life. Before he entered the seminary, Pfleger dedicated himself to working for social justice and to making the Scriptures relevant to the circumstances in his urban community.

Over time Pfleger became increasingly committed to his vision of social justice, and with his appointment as pastor of St. Sabina, he became more concerned about the problems of homelessness, drug abuse, violence, and alcoholism in the neighborhood. When the parish's membership rose in the early 1980s, Father Mike found himself in a position to use his congregation to confront these problems. In the summer of 1989, he initiated the church's first antidrug marches by proclaiming, "We've talked enough and prayed enough. Now it's time to get up off our knees and do something" (Glanton and Thornton 1989). Within a short period of time, these marches drew as many as three hundred people and targeted more than one hundred businesses and residences suspected of manufacturing and selling drug paraphernalia (Glanton and Thornton 1989).[1]

The campaign against drug- and alcohol-related problems continued in different forms the following summers. In the summer of 1990, parishioners protested alcohol and tobacco advertisements by whitewashing more than forty billboards advertising liquor and tobacco products on Chicago's south side. In the summer of 1991, St. Sabina joined with another south side parish to organize Chicago residents for a national boycott of G. Heileman Brewing Company, which planned to market and sell a new high-alcohol malt liquor called Powermaster that was specifically targeted toward African Americans.

Then in the summer of 1993, in response to a flurry of violent crime, St. Sabina began its weekly antidrug marches every Friday at 9 P.M., an hour police said was the most violent time in the neighborhood. The marches, which have continued every summer since 1993, serve a variety of purposes. While some parishioners and neighborhood residents see the marches as raising the awareness of the community and cautioning liquor store owners against dis-

playing drug paraphernalia, Pfleger sees the marches as occasions to reach out to the community while also putting gang members and drug dealers on notice. "[Friday night is] when the Church should be in the streets," Pfleger declares. "Either we believe that the power of God is greater than the power of Satan, or we don't" (O'Hara 1994).

But how is Father Mike able to generate such high levels of participation in these weekly antidrug marches? What strategies does he use to mobilize his parishioners, and how successful are his strategies in producing the desired outcomes? To help frame the answers to these questions, it is helpful to explore the insights offered not only by scholars of religion and politics but also by social movement theorists.

The Role of Leaders in the Religion and Politics and Social Movements Literature

One of the most straightforward ways that clergy can influence the political behavior of their parishioners is through the messages they deliver at church.[2] These messages may come in the form of statements from the pulpit, conversations with parishioners, announcements in the church bulletin, or symbols (such as artwork or posters) designed to represent the "congregation's collective stance on sociopolitical issues" (Welch et al. 1993, 235).[3] Although scholars of religion and politics have long recognized the ability of clergy to influence their parishioners through these political messages, there is little evidence that churchgoers actually respond to the political stimuli. Until the publication of Welch and colleagues' (1993) study of political cue perceptions and congregational responses, no research had tested the direct effects of cue perceptions on political attitudes and behaviors.[4] Welch and colleagues found that political cue perceptions do, in fact, influence churchgoers' *attitudes* on such issues as abortion, prayer in public school, and homelessness.[5] But they were not able to determine whether political cues (about such things as the importance of political activism) influence churchgoers' general levels of political *participation,* much less their participation in church-based collective action.[6]

Social movement theory offers one of the most useful theoretical perspectives for understanding how some religious leaders, especially those who hope to mobilize their congregations for collective action, can mold parishioners'

attitudes to get them to participate in political activism. The leaders of social movements can generate participation by relying on their understanding of and appreciation for the values and identities of the group(s) they wish to mobilize (Ferree 1992; Morris and Mueller 1992; Mueller 1992; Snow and Benford 1988; Snow et al. 1986). Movement leaders are most effective either when they use group loyalties and identities to confirm the correctness of the linkage between their own identity and participation in the movement, or when they promote particular understandings or interpretations of the movement that resonate with the group's identity and cultural traditions.

Social movement theorists describe movement leaders' strategies using the concept of *frame,* which is an "interpretive schemata that simplifies and condenses [the world] by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one's present and past environment" (Snow and Benford 1992, 137). When movement leaders use frames, they do so to underscore the seriousness of a particular social problem—and to mobilize people to address the problem by explaining how the condition resonates with their personal experiences (Snow and Benford 1988).

If politically active clergy use similar framing strategies for generating collective action, we should expect ministers like Father Mike Pfleger to use a variety of frames. First, like other social activists, ministers will attempt to increase their congregation members' perception that the problems they seek to address are changeable, and that they can bring about the desired changes if they participate. McAdam (1982) calls this "cognitive liberation." Secondly, such ministers will attempt to redefine membership in the church to include participation in collective action by linking the parishioners' identity to the goals of the movement. Finally, they will present an overall interpretation of the collective action that resonates with the church's identity and worldview.

Results

Addressing the Concern About Self-Selection

One of the most serious problems in measuring the influence of clergy's political cues on their laity (as Jelen and Guth note in chapters 2 and 3) is that the correspondence between clerical and lay attitudes on politics may be a consequence of self-selection. It may be that "church members select religious

environments in which their preferred values are expressed" (Jelen chapter 2, page 25; see also Gilbert 1993, 10). To address this criticism as it relates to the activism at St. Sabina, I investigated whether the participants in the church's antidrug marches were already predisposed to participate in this form of activism before they joined the parish. I tested this by asking respondents: "Did you know about St. Sabina's political activities before you began attending?" and, if so, "Was that a factor in your decision to attend?"[7] Parishioners who knew about the church's political activities prior to joining the church are slightly more likely to participate in the church's antidrug marches than are parishioners who were not aware of the activities. While 71.9 percent of those who knew of the church's political activities eventually became marchers, only 59.0 percent of those who had no prior knowledge joined the marches.[8]

Although these data appear to offer some justification for a self-selection argument (that the marchers joined the parish because of the church's social action), more detailed analyses do not support the self-selection hypothesis. Taking only the 32 respondents who knew about the church's social action before attending, I asked respondents directly: "Was that a factor in your decision to attend" the church? Those who responded "Yes, it influenced my decision," are about equally likely to march as are those who responded "No, it did not influence my decision" (71.4 percent versus 72.2 percent).[9] These data clearly show that most of the activists made the decision to march only after their initial affiliation with the parish. Even if parishioners' decisions to join the church were influenced by their awareness of its political activities, this factor does not explain their subsequent involvement in the antidrug marches.

The fact that self-selection does not explain parishioners' participation in the antidrug marches suggests that something they are exposed to in the parish context itself must raise their awareness of the importance of these sociopolitical activities. To wit: many of my respondents indicated that the church itself increased their awareness of the importance of participating in the marches. One young female respondent, for example, spoke about how the church itself raised her awareness of the value of community involvement: "It used to be that political activities weren't important to me. That's just where I was at. So that wasn't important to me in terms of my draw to this church. But the church raised my awareness of the importance of these political activities by showing my responsibility as a Christian. . . . They showed me how politics is important to our lives as Christians" (personal interview 071, 8 De-

cember 1996). Based on such evidence, it is clear that church members' decisions to join the marches are not due to self-selection. Rather, whatever motivates parishioners to become involved in the weekly antidrug marches appears to be located within the context of the parish itself. Because of the attention that scholars have given to the role of clergy in the church context (Gilbert 1993; Wald, Owen, and Hill 1988, 1990), it is important to examine the influence of Father Mike and the themes he presents in his sermons.

Exposure to Father Mike at the 11:15 A.M. Mass

One of the chief ways to begin exploring whether Father Mike's preaching and personality influence parishioners' decisions to become involved in the church's antidrug activism is by measuring the degree to which parishioners are exposed to him and his messages at religious services. Father Mike almost always presides at the 11:15 A.M. Sunday service, while visiting priests preside at the other weekend services. The difference among these various presiders is not only one of style (Father Mike is much more charismatic in his presentation) but also one of substance. Unlike the other priests, Father Mike is not hesitant to use the homily, which can last anywhere from an hour to an hour and a half, as an opportunity for extended instruction on the Bible. While the presiders' homilies are almost always in the traditional Catholic vein (in that they are composed of a few spiritual reflections related to the day's readings), Father Mike offers what is typically known as a sermon. With a microphone pressed against his lips and a handkerchief clasped in his hand, he takes some of the most "demanding" teachings from Scripture and, in a voice resembling a dynamic black preacher (though Father Mike is white), relates those teachings directly to the parishioners' day-to-day lives. "Father Mike teaches difficult principles," the president of the parish council relates. "If you go to church and you feel the same way when you come out as you did when you went in, that's not doing anything for you" (O'Hara 1994).

To measure the influence of exposure to Father Mike's preaching on parishioners' participation in the antidrug marches, I tested whether those who attend the 11:15 A.M. mass (and hence are most exposed to Father Mike) are more likely than those who attend the other services to be recruited into activism. Indeed, people who attend the 11:15 A.M. mass are significantly more likely to participate in the antidrug marches than are people who attend the other masses (73.2 percent to 34.5 percent, respectively).[10] A number of my respon-

dents specifically indicated that their participation in the 11:15 mass influenced their decision to join the antidrug activism. For instance, when I asked one middle-aged female respondent whether she had participated in the marches during the previous summer, she stated: "No, I didn't participate then because I . . . wasn't going to the 11:15 service. I was going to the 8:30. . . . There seems to be a huge difference between the 8:30 and the 11:15 services, and I know the pastor is really trying to bring our church together, bring us together as one, because it's almost like there are two different churches, between the 8:30 and the 11:15. . . . I think the people at the 8:30 service get the message [about the marches], they just don't participate as much" (personal interview 007, 30 March 1996). What is it about the 11:15 A.M. service and Father Mike's preaching that explains this difference?

Receiving Cues for Participation

Because so many more parishioners who attend the 11:15 A.M. mass participate in the church's antidrug activism, one might think that those attending at 11:15 are simply more likely to hear announcements at church about the church's collective action and, in response, decide to join the campaign in larger numbers. In other words, perhaps Father Mike is more likely than the other priests to provide cues for participation during his sermons and thus to mobilize more churchgoers for collective action. Such a possibility is not out of the question given studies that illustrate the influence of pastoral cues on churchgoers' stances on political issues (Welch et al. 1993) and prospects for mobilization (Morris 1984).

To test this possibility, I asked a subsample of my respondents "How often has Father Mike or another parish leader encouraged you *in their sermons or announcements at church* to participate in the Friday night marches?"[11] Answers to this question revealed that those who attend the 11:15 A.M. service are *not* more likely to receive these kinds of general cues for participation. While 39 percent of those who attend the 11:15 mass reported receiving cues a "great deal" of the time during the liturgy, about an equal number of those who attend the other masses (35.3 percent) reported receiving cues with such frequency. Clearly, then, there appears to be no difference in the *frequency* with which the various priests provide cues for participation. Something besides simple encouragement must explain the higher levels of mobilization among people who attend the 11:15 mass.

Perhaps the framing used by Father Mike is similar to the framing conducted by social movement leaders. If so, we should expect parishioners who are most exposed to Father Mike's preaching to exhibit (1) higher levels of political efficacy; (2) a belief that membership in the church entails participation in the activism; and (3) an understanding of the activism that resonates with their identity as Christians.

Developing a Sense of Political Efficacy

One of the most crucial strategies of social movement leaders, as McAdam (1982) points out, entails changing the consciousness of the actors involved so that those who were once pessimistic about their ability to effect change become instilled with a new sense of optimism. "People who are ordinarily fatalistic," Piven and Cloward state, ". . . begin to assert 'rights' that imply demands for change" (1979, 3–4).

My year of observation confirms that Father Mike (more than the other priests who assist at the church) conveys messages during his homilies that are designed to increase political efficacy among parishioners and to link that sense of efficacy with involvement in the Friday night marches. I frequently heard Father Mike make explicit statements to the congregation to convince them of their ability to bring about changes in the neighborhood. Many of my respondents confirmed this observation. Describing the philosophy that Father Mike communicates during the Sunday homily, one of the female heads of ministry stated: "[Father Mike believes that] if people can believe that their effort makes a difference, . . . that life can be better if they believe it can be, then they walk with a certain amount of power. And political power is important because it brings about change. . . . *The whole focus is to show people that their effort does make a difference. One man can make a difference.* But you got to be able to convince people of that" (personal interview 030, 30 March 1996).

To test whether those who are most exposed to Father Mike's preaching possess the highest levels of political efficacy, I asked all respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "People like me don't have any say about what the local government and city council does."[12] As table 13.1 reports, people who attend the 11:15 service have significantly higher levels of efficacy than do those who attend other weekend services. While 87.1 percent of those who attend the 11:15 service disagreed either "somewhat" or "strongly"

TABLE 13.1. *Parishioners' Feelings of Political Efficacy, by Attendance at Religious Services*

	Agree Strongly or Somewhat	Disagree Strongly or Somewhat	ROW TOTAL
Attend 11:15 service	9 (12.9%)	61 (87.1%)	70
Attend other services	10 (32.3%)	21 (67.7%)	31
COLUMN TOTAL	19	82	101

SOURCE: Compiled by author from 1996 interviews in Chicago. $N = 101$.

NOTES: Responding to the statement "People like me don't have any say about what the local government and city council does."

Chi-square = 5.29; $p = 0.021$. Percentages are row percents.

with the statement "People like me don't have any say about what the local government and city council does," only 67.7 percent of those who attend other services reported likewise.[13] These data provide clear evidence that people who attend the 11:15 mass are exposed to various ideologies that enhance their feelings of political efficacy.

But what is it about the content of the ideologies taught at 11:15 that increases churchgoers' feelings of efficacy? On close inspection of the Sunday liturgies, it becomes clear that the feelings of efficacy generated and sustained in this context are based largely on *religious* beliefs and values—beliefs and values that appeal to the congregation because they rest on the parishioners' *identities* as Christians. To bolster parishioners' sense of efficacy (and ultimately their participation in community activism), Father Mike stresses their *religious* identities by teaching them that if they genuinely believe they are "doing God's work" in the community, God will not only protect them but will also ensure their success in achieving their goals. For parishioners who attend Father Mike's liturgies, therefore, feelings of efficacy are derived from a "transcendental" source, their belief that "God is on their side."

These feelings of divine assistance, according to Smith, can "relativize what might otherwise seem insurmountable" (1996, 10). The respondents' own comments regarding their feelings of efficacy confirm this assertion. Many respondents indicated, for instance, that their feelings of efficacy were based largely on their underlying realization that "God was at their side" as they participated in the weekly antidrug marches. For example, one young male respondent who regularly attends the 11:15 service related: "Here we are taught

that you just can't talk the talk, you have to walk the walk. You have to go out and actively make a change. You learn about [this] . . . here in church on Sunday . . . , but then you actively go out on a Friday night . . . to show by example, by word, . . . that *we can make a difference. Our voice does count. And it's because of Jesus that our voice counts.* Because it's not really us, it's the God in us that makes the difference" (personal interview 031, 14 July 1996). Clearly, as this statement reveals, parishioners believe that their effectiveness in addressing the problems in the community rests in a transcendental source. While some parishioners had, before coming to St. Sabina, eschewed various forms of social action, believing that such battles "might never be won," many of these same parishioners have been infused through their involvement in the Sunday services with a new sense of efficacy that is rooted in their faith. Obviously, therefore, religious ideologies have an impact on feelings of efficacy, and these feelings of efficacy can and do translate into active participation in the church's community activism.

Redefining Church Membership to Include Active Participation

Another strategy that social movement leaders use to increase participation in collective action entails redefining membership in the group to include activism. McAdam (1982) observed this strategy when he studied the role of black clergy during the civil rights movement. "In the case of most church-based campaigns, it was not so much that movement participants were recruited from among the ranks of active churchgoers as it was a case of church membership itself being redefined to include movement participation as a primary requisite of the role" (McAdam 1982, 129). During the civil rights movement, clergy called for attendance at the mass meetings in much the same way that they called for attendance at other religious functions. Because participation in both kinds of activities was portrayed as a religious duty, anyone who called him- or herself a Christian felt obliged to do both.

Father Mike uses the same type of strategy at the 11:15 service. My 104 interviews show that those who are most exposed to Father Mike's preaching are somewhat more likely to define church membership to include active participation in the church's ministry programs in general. Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement "To be a *committed member* of St. Sabina, it is important to participate in some form of parish ministry."[14] Most parishioners (85.3 percent) said they believe church members

TABLE 13.2. *Parishioners' Attitudes about the Importance of Participation in Parish Ministry, by Attendance at Religious Services*

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Do Not Agree	ROW TOTAL
Attend 11:15 service	41	21	8	70
	(58.6%)	(30.0%)	(11.4%)	
Attend other services	14	11	7	32
	(43.8%)	(34.4%)	(21.9%)	
COLUMN TOTAL	55	32	15	102

SOURCE: Compiled by author from 1996 interviews in Chicago. $N = 102$.

NOTES: Responding to the statement "To be a committed member of St. Sabina, it is important to participate in some form of parish ministry."

Chi-square = 2.66; $p = 0.26$. Percentages are row percents.

should be involved in some form of parish ministry. But as table 13.2 shows, people who attend the 11:15 service are slightly more likely than those who attend the other masses to agree that church members should be so active. While 58.6 percent of those who attend the 11:15 service "agree strongly" that participation in ministry is important to be a committed member of the church, only 43.8 percent of those who attend other masses reported likewise.[15] This shows that Father Mike's Sunday homilies encourage higher levels of commitment to the church's ministry programs in general (and possibly to the church's antidrug marches in particular) than do the homilies delivered at the other weekend religious services. Qualitative evidence lends support to this interpretation.

Perhaps the clearest example of Father Mike linking membership in the church to participation in its social outreach is his statement at a meeting of the parish's leadership in the summer of 1996. At this occasion, Father Mike challenged the lay leaders of the parish to assume higher levels of commitment to the church's social action:

> We can never become just an okay church. . . . It's like the child who can go to school and get As, but comes home with Cs. . . . We do not want to be a church that passes; we want to be a church that excels. . . . In the book of Ephesians, the fourth chapter verses 1–16, The Word tells us that God equips the saints to build up the body, and the reason He builds up the body of Christ is for a work. It's not just to be built up to be built up. It's to be built up to do something. Brothers and sisters, *there is no such thing as a Christian without work.* . . . We are called for works of service. . . . There is no such thing as an active or an inactive member. Some of you might say that I'm a member, I'm just not an active member.

> You ain't a member. I'll make that very clear. From the Bible's standpoint, *there's no such thing as an inactive member. If you're not active, if you're not involved, you're not in membership here!* (personal observation of parish leadership meeting, 27 July 1996).

This statement is one of many that reveal the extent to which Father Mike links membership in the church with high levels of commitment to activism in general, or what he calls "works of service." He communicates a very similar kind of message during his homilies at the 11:15 service. On one Sunday, for example, Father Mike preached about the importance of involvement in the parish's social justice activities by comparing less committed Christians to what he called "live-in lovers." As he stated, "A 'live-in' Christian is one who is in it for what he or she gets out of it. But Christians should not be coming to church just to feel good. We don't have a Santa Claus God. . . . It is not about what you gain in life, but about what you are willing to lose. What you are willing to commit yourself to doing" (personal observation of homily, 1 September 1996).

Many of the 11:15 parishioners told me about how they have incorporated this way of thinking into their own beliefs about what church membership entails. Some of these parishioners are so committed to Father Mike's vision of social justice that they regard it as an *essential* component of belonging to the church. Several respondents stated that if members were not committed to the social outreach dimensions of the church, then they should ask themselves whether they legitimately could be called members of the church. One young male respondent, for instance, stated: "If I'm going to be committed here, how can I be committed to only three-fourths of here, or one quarter of here? Either I'm committed here, or I'm not committed here. And so from that standpoint, I've been really challenged in some of the areas of social justice. . . . I think it's important that we get behind the vision of the pastor, and *to the extent that you have problems with the vision of the pastor, then I believe you have to really ask God about whether you are supposed to be here*" (personal interview 013, 17 March 1996). Statements like his reveal the powerful influence of the beliefs, values, and ideas that Father Mike communicates during the 11:15 service. Parishioners have internalized his vision of the church as a "social justice" church, and his vision of the people of God as "Doers of the Word." This vision translates into actual participation in the Friday night marches.

Constructing Shared Meanings of Collective Action

Perhaps the most crucial strategy employed by social movement leaders is framing, or constructing common meanings or understandings (frames) of the goals of the social action so that they can invoke those meanings at key periods to enhance participation. In order to examine whether Father Mike employs this strategy at St. Sabina, I first needed to observe what kinds of understandings my respondents had of the church's antidrug activism. To do this, I asked respondents two questions designed to tap the meanings they assign to the Friday night marches: (1) "Overall, do you think the Friday night marches are beneficial?" and (2) "In what ways are they beneficial?" Answers to the second question revealed some variation in the meanings assigned to the church's antidrug marches; some respondents believe the marches are beneficial primarily for the social and political objectives they accomplish, and others believe they are beneficial primarily for their religious and proselytizing functions. A third group of respondents combine both of these interpretations.[16]

For a majority of the respondents (83.5 percent), the meaning of the marches is either sociopolitical or religious. Among these, 45 respondents (or 46.4 percent) indicate that they believe the marches are beneficial primarily for their *social and political objectives.* An example of this kind of response is the following statement by a middle-aged male respondent: "These marches were beneficial because the media came and the media had this on television showing thousands of people what our plight was. You know, therefore, without these demonstrations, no one would have known, and no one would have cared. Politicians hate to see people carrying signs. . . . This may not always solve our problems, but at least it gets their attention" (personal interview 008, 17 March 1996). In contrast to this view, 36 other respondents (37.1 percent) reported that they believe the marches are beneficial primarily because they share knowledge and awareness of Christ with people on the streets. One young male parishioner is typical of those who stress the marches' religious utility: "The Friday night marches are beneficial primarily because we're . . . drawing individuals into the body of Christ who don't see the Light, who haven't seen the Light. These are individuals who have expressed to their peers that there is no hope out there, this is the only way of life. There's drugs and gangbanging, or whatever. So to actually see some individuals come in off the

street into the church as a result of us marching and singing and that whole thing is really tremendous" (personal interview 006, 28 March 1996).

A third group of respondents (16, or 16.5 percent) believe that the antidrug marches are beneficial because they serve both political and religious objectives. These respondents link the "spiritual" mission of the marches (their religious and proselytizing functions) to the larger social agenda of raising the consciousness of the community (their social and political functions). This view was expressed by a young female church member who explained that "our Friday night marches are two parts: It's offering love to those that are in need. But also it's making a stand saying that we cannot allow [the drug dealing] to continue to go on. Drugs kill" (personal interview 002, 20 April 1996). This variation in meanings that church members assign to the antidrug marches is, in and of itself, an interesting point of description. But how does Father Mike influence the meanings that church members assign to the marches, and what outcome does this influence have?

While one might expect the frames Father Mike uses during Sunday services to emphasize the sociopolitical importance of the marches (which, after all, were initiated to address a variety of social concerns), his frames actually appear to highlight the religious and proselytizing goals of the marches to a much greater degree. During several of the homilies he delivered during the spring and summer of 1996, Father Mike related the Friday night marches to the themes of the Scripture readings, thereby stressing their religious and proselytizing functions. During two of the Sunday homilies in July 1996, for example, Father Mike preached on the parable of the sower in the Gospel of Mark (4:3–20) and said that those who participate in the marches are sowers of the seed of God's Word to those in the neighborhood. To make this image come alive for the parishioners, he even provided those who agreed to participate in the marches during the first few weeks of July with tiny bags of seeds, which were supposed to symbolize the seed of God's Word. He asked the marchers to bestow that Word on various people in the neighborhood and on the streets. In describing the format of the antidrug marches that would take place that July, Father Mike stated: "When you receive the bag [of seeds from the minister], acknowledge that the Lord and the Holy Spirit prompts you to put His seed out [to someone on the streets], but when you seed, speak what you're seeding. So if you're seeding love, if you're seeding the breaking of the

TABLE 13.3. *Parishioners' Positions on the Benefits of Antidrug Marches, by Attendance at Religious Services*

	"Marches raise consciousness of neighborhood and press for changes in policy"	"Marches raise consciousness of neighborhood and evangelize those on the street"	"Marches are a tool for evangelism—they show people on the street an alternative way"	ROW TOTAL
Attend 11:15 service	23 (33.3%)	13 (18.8%)	33 (47.8%)	69
Attend other services	22 (78.6%)	3 (10.7%)	3 (10.7%)	28
COLUMN TOTAL	45	16	36	97

SOURCE: Compiled by author from 1996 interviews in Chicago. $N = 97$.
NOTE: Chi-square = 16.98; $p = 0.0002$. Percentages are row percents.

stronghold of alcoholism, or whatever, and if you'll give [the bag] to somebody and say, 'This just represents the seed of God's life in you, of God's blessing in you,' and speak it in a positive way" (personal observation of pre-march gathering, 19 July 1996).

My interviews establish the fact that framing devices like the seeds have an impact on parishioners' interpretations of the marches. Table 13.3 shows that those who attend the 11:15 service and are consequently most exposed to Father Mike's preaching are significantly more likely than those who attend the other masses to adopt a religious interpretation (frame) of the marches (47.8 percent and 10.7 percent, respectively).[17] Father Mike's framing strategies clearly have an effect on the meanings parishioners assign to the church's antidrug activism. Why, however, would Father Mike explicitly promote this particular interpretation of the marches over and above a sociopolitical interpretation? And what consequences, if any, can be attributed to the framing devices he has chosen?

The Effects of Father Mike's Mobilization Strategies

Father Mike's sermons influence some members of St. Sabina to adopt certain attitudes and beliefs about the marches and their ability to bring about change in the community. In comparison to other parishioners, parishioners with the most exposure to Father Mike's preaching have higher levels of political efficacy. Similarly, they are more likely to believe that membership in the church entails participation in the church's ministries, and they are more likely to subscribe to a religious interpretation of the marches. But to what ex-

TABLE 13.4. *Factors Affecting Parishioners' Participation in Antidrug Marches (estimated net effects)*

	Model 1		Model 2	
Factor	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
Attendance at 11:15 mass	1.826***	0.857	1.380*	0.560
Feelings of political efficacy			0.889	0.614
Commitment to parish ministry			0.706**	0.270
Religious view of activism			0.482#	0.292
Constant	−2.572**	0.493	−7.309***	1.912

SOURCE: Compiled by author from 1996 interviews in Chicago. $N = 95$.

NOTE: Model 1 chi-square (1) = 15.01; $p = 0.001$; Pseudo-$R^2 = 0.136$. Model 2 chi-square (3) = 13.48; $p = 0.01$; Pseudo-$R^2 = 0.231$. #$p < 0.10$; *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

tent do these attitudes have an influence on actual participation in the Friday night marches? To what extent does Father Mike, by promoting these beliefs, succeed in generating active participation?

Table 13.4 reports the results of two logistic regression models designed to test the effect of these attitudes on parishioners' participation in the antidrug marches. Model 1 begins by showing that attendance at the 11:15 service does significantly influence involvement in the antidrug marches. Those who attend the 11:15 mass are significantly more likely to participate in the antidrug marches than those who do not. It is also important, however, to test whether it is Father Mike's teachings and not some other factor at the 11:15 service (such as exposure to friends who may invite members to the marches) that produces this effect. Accordingly, model 2 tests the influence of Father Mike's teachings while controlling for attendance at this service. If adding measures of exposure to Father Mike's teachings reduces the significant positive influence of church attendance on participation in the marches, then we can be confident that it is Father Mike's teachings, and not some other factor at the services, that explains parishioners' recruitment to antidrug activism.

As model 2 reports, the attitudinal variables are not only significantly related to involvement in the antidrug marches, but they substantially diminish the significant positive relationship observed in the previous model between 11:15 attendance and participation in antidrug activism. This shows that Father Mike's teachings are in fact an important factor explaining the relationship between 11:15 attendance and involvement in activism. As the model illustrates, two of the attitudinal variables emerge as significant predictors of activism when the other variables are controlled. Both those who report that

membership in the church entails commitment to its ministries and those who adopt a religious interpretation of the activism, are significantly more likely than other parishioners to become involved in the marches. Interestingly, attitudes of political efficacy exhibited no net relationship to participation in the marches. As model 2 clearly indicates, two of the attitudes that Father Mike promotes about the marches have a significant influence on parishioners' decisions to become active—independent of whatever other factors the 11:15 parishioners may be exposed to at that service.[18]

There is, however, one additional way to explore whether Father Mike's framing of the marches as "acts of evangelization" has an influence on participation in the marches. By observing the marches through the spring and summer of 1996, I was able to assess whether Father Mike's explicit framing of the marches as "sowing of the seeds" enhanced participation in the marches in the weeks immediately following the frame's adoption. I indeed saw that the marches had a noticeable increase in participation in the weeks immediately following the "sowing of the seeds" frame. The marches held before Father Mike introduced the "sowing of the seeds" theme (mid-May to July 5, 1996) were averaging between 60 and 70 participants, which were low attendance figures in comparison to the previous year. The marches immediately following the new framing (July 12–26, 1996), though, averaged more than 150 participants. Clearly many parishioners were motivated to participate that summer out of a desire to evangelize the neighborhood by "sharing the seeds of God's love" with people on the streets.[19]

When I asked one of the parish leaders to comment on the parish's adoption of the new frame and the effect it had on participation, she stated: "I think it did have an effect, I truly do. Even though there were some people who couldn't come, they called and said, 'I'm sorry I can't make it tonight.' So I think by us really emphasizing the fact of evangelization, it drew a lot of more people. Because they thought or figured we're not goin' ahead and starting a war. Some people aren't into that; they're just not into confrontation" (personal interview 035, 19 August 1996).

The results of this analysis clearly show that the mobilization strategies employed by Father Mike during the 11:15 A.M. mass, St. Sabina's major Sunday religious ritual, were successful in mobilizing parishioners for the church's antidrug activism. Through his homilies at these services, Father Mike raised

parishioners' sense of political efficacy. He challenged them to redefine membership in the church to encompass participation in its activism. He offered his more religiously motivated parishioners a way of seeing the marches as a way of proselytizing the community. By preaching these three messages, Father Mike was able to recruit large numbers of parishioners to join the weekly antidrug marches, and in so doing, he taught his congregation how to be "Doers of the Word, and not just Hearers of the Word."

But what other conclusions may be drawn from this analysis? First, the findings presented here confirm that politically active clergy (like social movement leaders more generally) are likely to enjoy the most success at mobilization when they choose wide frames that have the potential to resonate with diverse audiences. It is especially crucial for them to reach their religiously motivated adherents, whose religious and cultural identities as Christians are important resources for activism. Parish leaders at St. Sabina were able to increase participation in the antidrug marches through the summer of 1996 by labeling them not only as "marches to take back the streets from drugs and violence" but also as "Friday night ministry walks." In other words, the dual framing of the Friday night marches led to a much greater turnout for the marches than would have been the case if they were framed in either strictly political or strictly religious terms.

This observation is not new to the literature on religion and social movements; in a variety of other settings, scholars have observed the successes achieved by movements that draw on both political and religious themes. Osa (1996), for example, has recently illustrated how participation in the Solidarity movement in Poland was enhanced by leaders' efforts to combine both religious *and* political themes. Smith (1991) has shown that commitment to the liberation theology movement in Latin America grew due to the combined agendas of its religious *and* political adherents. Although it is difficult to draw direct connections between these national or international social movements and the mini–social movement observed at St. Sabina, it is clear that in all of these cases, participation is increased when framing strategies try to incorporate themes that are salient among diverse audiences.

These findings also make an important contribution to the literature on religion and politics, particularly in reference to how clergy can enhance political participation through cue giving. Until recently, most of the literature that examines the influence of cue giving on political attitudes and behaviors has

tried to gauge exposure to cues through indirect measures like church attendance (Gilbert 1993; Welch et al. 1993). My analysis, however, provides a more concrete way of conceptualizing and measuring the various ways in which the political and religious messages of a minister can mobilize his or her congregation. This study offers insight into how clergy in other settings might stimulate political participation among their congregations by promoting certain attitudes and beliefs. My findings clearly show that clergy's teachings about the importance of political participation must be rooted in their understanding of and appreciation for the values and identities of their congregations if they are to succeed in the project of mobilization.

This page intentionally left blank

14 Choices and Consequences in Context

SUE E. S. CRAWFORD AND
LAURA R. OLSON

The purpose of this volume has been to explain some of the similarities and differences that characterize the choices that Christian clergy make about political involvement and the consequences of those choices. We have paid special attention to the influences of the various contexts in which clergy work. The broader aim has been to illustrate that the choices American clergy make about politics have important ramifications for democratic citizenship in the United States and for studies of politics more broadly. Analysis of the choices clergy make about politics, as well as the consequences of these choices, contributes to our understanding of many facets of the world of politics, such as mobilization, interest groups, opinion leadership, and social movements.

The chapters in this volume provide insight and tools with which to answer a variety of questions that are raised by the contrast between Rev. Creech and Rev. Yearick presented in the first chapter. What theological and personal factors are most likely to encourage some clergy to take a public stand on an issue like homosexual rights? Which political and religious contexts make it more or less difficult for clergy to take such stands? What factors divide those who stand on the conservative side of the issue from those who support the expansion of homosexual rights? What difference does it make in our political system when clergy take stands on controversial issues?

As each chapter points out, understanding the choices clergy make and the consequences of those choices requires analysis that combines attention to the personal and theological backgrounds of clergy with attention to the contexts in which clergy work. Specific religious institutions, the status of race relations, cultural attitudes towards gender roles, and political party alignments all play important roles in shaping the ways in which clergy choose to approach politics. These factors also bear heavily on clergy's effectiveness in shaping political attitudes and citizenship norms. Each chapter provides evidence about how these choices and consequences are shaped by different contexts. Moreover, each chapter contributes new theories or tools

for future studies of the choices and consequences of clergy involvement in politics.

This concluding chapter examines how the findings presented in this volume fit into existing lines of research on the influence of context on clergy's choices and their consequences. It also examines how the chapters respond to the calls for research presented by Ted Jelen and James Guth. What have we added to our understanding of the unique roles clergy play as public citizens, opinion leaders, and political educators of citizens? What are the questions that remain largely unstudied?

Political Choices

In chapter 3 Guth argues that two aspects of clergy's political choices in particular call out for further study: the *socialization* of clergy and the *mobilization* of clergy. Most of the chapters on political choices answer this call by demonstrating how socialization and mobilization are shaped by the contexts in which clergy serve. These chapters emphasize three dominant contexts: religious context, political context, and socioeconomic context.

Religious Context

Since religion is the explicit calling and business of clergy, it seems obvious that theology, religious traditions, and religious worldviews would influence their political choices. Previous studies outline the ways in which theology and religious worldviews influence the choices clergy make about politics (Beatty and Walter 1989; Davidson, Johnson, and Mock 1990; Guth 1984; Guth et al. 1997; Hadden 1969; Jelen 1993; Johnson 1967, 1998; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Quinley 1974; Roof and McKinney 1987; Roozen, McKinney, and Carroll 1984; Stark et al. 1971).

This emphasis on theology and religious tradition also resonates through many of the chapters in this volume. Jelen notes that different religious worldviews concerning the authority and role of clergy influence the resources that clergy are able to bring to political action as well as their potential effectiveness in mobilizing their congregations. Clergy who work in more orthodox traditions, where they are considered to have the authority to speak "the truth," are more likely to feel that they can also speak "the truth" about politics. Clergy in more progressive traditions, on the other hand, are more

likely to assume that their roles in both politics and religious teaching should focus on raising questions and providing guidance but not on giving answers. These two opposing views of religious authority (see Hunter 1991; Wuthnow 1988) have very different implications for clergy who seek ways to challenge people in the pews to democratic participation. Clergy from the "truth" perspective should find it much easier to make direct and explicit calls for participation on a political issue than should clergy from the "questioning" tradition.

James Penning and Corwin Smidt show how these two approaches to religion and politics play out in their analysis of the political choices of Reformed Calvinist clergy. Clergy in the more conservative tradition (CRC) are more likely to become involved in politics if they agree with the statement that there is one correct view on most political issues, which is consistent with the orthodox outlook. But those in the more liberal tradition (RCA) are more likely to act if they agree with the statement that clergy need to cooperate in politics, a view that fits with the more progressive "questioning" tradition. It is also worth noting that Penning and Smidt's findings suggest that clergy who have views of religiopolitical authority that match those of their denomination may be easier to mobilize for political action. But those clergy who embrace a political ideology that is *inconsistent* with the mainstream of their religious tradition (liberals in the CRC and conservatives in the RCA) are *more* mobilized for politics. Clergy who feel comfortable with their religious role but feel that their tradition is misguided ideologically may have the strongest incentives to speak and act politically because they feel comfortable with the view of authority in their tradition and they have contrary viewpoints to express.

Theology and religious tradition also influence clergy's political choices. A rather large volume of research, especially in sociology, examines the effect of hierarchical and decentralized religious institutional structures on clergy's political choices (Hammond, Salinas, and Sloane 1978; Hougland and Wood 1979; Wood 1970, 1981). The chapters in this volume examine the effects of other aspects of the institutional structure of religious organizations. In particular, Timothy Byrnes's analysis of Catholic bishops highlights the interplay between their political choices and the institutional and theological context of the Roman Catholic Church. Institutional rules within the Catholic Church place clear restraints on the spectrum of political choices that are

available to bishops. Bishops who wish to affect politics and policy must remain true to the Church's teaching, even if doing so may appear politically inexpedient.

The chapter on women clergy examines a different aspect of religious institutions: their male-dominated clergy. For some women clergy, minority status influences the nature of the political issues that matter most to them, as well as their choices about whether to act on these concerns. Women clergy display a heightened awareness of discrimination issues because of their awareness of gender discrimination in their own profession. Some discuss the added constraints that their gender poses for political activity because of the prevalence of males in clergy positions, whereas only a few explain the political assets that their gender provides for political activity.

Political Context

As we noted in chapter 1, the American political culture leaves clergy mostly free from government regulation and allows religion to maintain a strong social presence. This cultural context heightens clergy's ability to act as public citizens and political educators in the United States. Some of the chapters in this volume note that the extent to which political issues are portrayed as moral issues influences clergy's political strategies and their effectiveness. When issues on the public agenda are framed as morality issues, clergy may feel a special call to participate in the public discourse. Moral framing of issues also opens the door to enhanced political effectiveness for clergy, because their statements on such issues may carry added weight.

In the United States, current tax law restricts party-oriented activity by religious institutions that wish to maintain their tax-exempt status. Churches and other religious organizations have had their tax-exempt status challenged due to excessive partisan activity. This legal context provides a concrete reason for clergy to steer clear of *party*-oriented politics and focus instead on *issue*-oriented politics. Moreover, many religious traditions have long applied strong normative pressure against explicitly partisan talk by clergy, which reinforces the pressure on clergy to choose issue-oriented (as opposed to party-oriented) strategies.[1]

Byrnes's analysis of Catholic bishops reveals that the cleavages that exist in a national political context have an important effect on clergy's political choices. It is more difficult for Catholic clergy in the United States to be mo-

bilized for politics because their issue agenda does not line up well with the positions of either major political party. The Church's position on abortion and its sympathy for school vouchers suggest an alliance with the Republican Party, but its positions on other social and economic issues resonate better with the agenda of the Democratic Party. In Poland, on the other hand, the issue positions of Catholic clergy do match existing political alliances—which facilitates their political mobilization.

In his chapter on Southern Baptist clergy, Guth shows how the current alignment of Southern Baptist political priorities with those of the Republican Party and conservative interest groups facilitates the mobilization of Southern Baptist clergy. Guth goes on to answer his own call for more research on the organizational mobilization of clergy by examining the organizational mobilization of Southern Baptist clergy in this context. He reports that clergy who are members of conservative, Republican-aligned interest groups such as the Christian Coalition, the American Family Association, and Focus on the Family are more likely to participate in political activities than are those who do not hold such memberships.

As these results show, clergy in religious traditions with political views that fit naturally with the agenda of a major political party are more likely to be mobilized for politics—and to have success in their efforts to encourage citizens to participate in elections and other political actions.

Mary Sawyer illustrates how discrimination has influenced the religious worldview of African American Protestants. The history of discrimination against African Americans has played a profound role in shaping the political choices available to black clergy. She demonstrates how the political theology and political strategies of African American clergy shifted as the political situation of African Americans changed. Her discussion of the evolution of African American clergy's political strategies demonstrates how clergy's political actions reflect religious traditions as well as the political realities that occur outside the walls of the church. Her chapter explains the key role that clergy's evolving social theology played in inspiring them to challenge citizens to political action.

Katie Day also examines the social theology of black clergy, but she looks at how different social theologies affect how ministers choose to get involved in local community development activities. She identifies two distinct strategies embraced by black clergy in North Philadelphia. Some choose to seek eco-

nomic development by working within the existing power and financial structure, while others choose to work in a coalition that seeks to further economic development by challenging the power structure. Although the clergy Day studied all work in similar neighborhoods of the same city, their strategy choices appear to be influenced by the types of neighborhoods in which they *live* and the types of schools they attended. She explains how these socialization experiences shape their social theology and how social theology in turn can explain political choices.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Studies of political choice have long emphasized the importance of socioeconomic conditions. The standard theory is that people with more resources (more education and higher incomes) are more likely to participate in politics (see Verba and Nie 1972). As Guth notes in chapter 9, some studies of clergy ignore socioeconomic status by arguing that clergy are too similar in education and income to expect differences along those lines. The chapters in this volume do little to bolster the notion that the socioeconomic status of individual clergy strongly influences their political choices. In fact, the results presented in chapters that include individual socioeconomic variables (Guth chapter 9; Penning and Smidt chapter 10) show that these variables do not matter if other factors, such as political and religious attitudes, are considered.

The chapter on urban clergy by Sue Crawford and Laura Olson examines socioeconomic conditions in a different light. Instead of examining the effects of the socioeconomic status of individual clergy, the chapter analyzes the effects of the socioeconomic conditions of the *neighborhoods* in which clergy work. Clergy who work in lower-income neighborhoods participate in local politics more than do those in neighborhoods of higher socioeconomic status. The chapter provides a method for testing mobilization mechanisms that explain why clergy who work in a particular context—in this case, low-income neighborhoods—are more strongly mobilized. The higher rates of participation on the part of clergy in lower-income neighborhoods appears to be explained by a mix of self-selection by politically interested clergy into such neighborhoods, the existence of a leadership vacuum in those neighborhoods, and government attention to those neighborhoods.

Political Consequences

In their introductory chapters, Jelen and Guth both note that research on the political consequences of clergy action is both scarcer and more difficult than research on their choices. The fact that relatively few chapters in this volume are devoted to consequences reflects this difficulty. Both Jelen and Guth argue that more research is needed on the consequences of clergy's political involvement. Their chapters, as well as several of the consequence chapters, cite evidence from existing research showing that what clergy say and do matters. Most of the emphasis in previous research has been placed on the consequences of clergy action for the opinions and actions of their congregations (Jelen 1992a; Kotler-Berkowitz 1998a, 1998b; Pallone 1965, 1966; Wald 1992; Welch et al. 1993). Two of the consequence chapters in this volume follow this thread in examining how clergy's actions affect the political opinions or actions of people who attend worship services at their churches.

Jelen notes that there are four possible ways in which clergy can influence members of their congregations. They can *reinforce* what the members already believe. They can help members see that certain political views can have a religious component and consequently deserve greater attention (*agenda setting*). Clergy may also *mobilize* members to act on their political beliefs. Finally, *conversion,* or changing the political views of members, is no doubt the most difficult consequence to bring about. Joel Fetzer's analysis of the effects of Anabaptist clergy on their congregation members' attitudes about pacifism suggests that these clergy are able to reinforce and possibly convert the views of their members concerning pacifism. Moreover, James Cavendish's chapter illustrates how Rev. Mike Pfleger appears to have succeeded in agenda setting and mobilization through his homilies.

Paul Djupe examines the possible effects that political statements made by one very visible religious leader, John Cardinal O'Connor, may have had on his public support. Djupe's work fits in a long line of studies that have examined the negative consequences often faced by politically active mainline Protestant clergy because they are unable to sway the political opinions of their congregations (Campbell and Pettigrew 1959; Hadden 1969; Hertzke 1988; Quinley 1974). Although other scholars have argued that congregations support their clergy more than this so-called "clergy-laity gap" would suggest

(Dudley 1991; Roozen, McKinney, and Carroll 1984), the risk of political action is still clearly a concern for many clergy (Crawford 1995; Crawford, Deckman, and Braun chapter 4; Olson 2000). Djupe argues that the consequences of clergy's political actions depend on the mix of political and spiritual benefits desired by members and provided by leaders. The consequences of *political* action cannot be examined in a vacuum apart from the consequences of clergy's other actions. A minister who provides sufficient spiritual benefits will have the latitude to act on more controversial political matters with less retribution from his or her congregation.

Religious Context

In their chapters, Fetzer, Cavendish, and Djupe analyze the consequences of clergy action in very different religious contexts. Fetzer's work focuses on Anabaptist denominations, which have a tradition of pacifism and an institutional structure that permits some level of congregational autonomy. In this setting, Fetzer finds that congregation members have pacifist attitudes that reflect those of their minister. After ruling out the possibility that the members just select churches led by pastors who agree with them, Fetzer shows that the pastors do reinforce, and even convert, members' political views.

Cavendish and Djupe both examine the consequences of actions by Roman Catholic clergy, Father Mike and Cardinal O'Connor. Even these two clergy serve in very different contexts: one is a parish priest, the other a key leader in the Church hierarchy. Cavendish notes that Father Mike, although he is white, serves a parish that is predominantly African American, so he adopts the style of black sermons more than the typical style of Catholic homilies. Thus Father Mike's success in mobilizing his parish to participate in antidrug marches probably says more about mobilization in an African American church setting than it does about mobilization in a Catholic setting. Cavendish's work clearly shows that African Americans can be mobilized outside of historically black denominations and even outside of Protestantism.

Cardinal O'Connor faced few negative consequences, in terms of his approval ratings, from his visible and controversial political statements, despite the fact that many Catholic New Yorkers disagreed with him. As Djupe points out, this may be the result of the distance between him and most Catholics in the New York City area. Most of them do not worship at St. Patrick's Cathedral in Manhattan; nor would they otherwise have come into contact with

O'Connor. Nor did most Catholic New Yorkers exit the archdiocese out of protest against O'Connor. This would have involved leaving either New York or the Catholic Church, which is obviously much harder than exiting a single parish out of disagreement with the priest.

Political Context

The mismatch between the Catholic Church's political stances and the current party alignments in the United States is relevant to Djupe's chapter in a more indirect way than it is to Byrnes's chapter. It is in this mismatched setting that Cardinal O'Connor made his political statements. Although his statements were controversial, few observers would argue that Cardinal O'Connor was in any political party's pocket. This fact, as well as the other factors Djupe notes, may have limited the harm that O'Connor's statements could cause to his support among New York City–area Catholics.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Rev. Mike Pfleger serves a parish in a low-income neighborhood on the south side of Chicago where violence and illegal drugs are rampant. These factors have a profound effect on the political context of his congregation. As Cavendish demonstrates, Father Mike is able to use his homilies to help members see antidrug marches as a religious activity (agenda setting). He is also able to use his homilies to mobilize people to march despite their own possible socioeconomic disadvantages. This finding is consistent with the recent observation that religious institutions may foster civic skills that allow people who lack other resources to participate in politics (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995).

Charting a Course for Future Research

The exclusive focus placed on Christian clergy in this volume reflects one of the glaring omissions in the study of clergy and politics: the lack of research on the contemporary political choices of American clergy of non-Christian faith traditions. It is particularly surprising that so little research has been done on Jewish clergy in the United States, given their long tradition of political activity. As the American Muslim population continues to grow, the analysis of Muslim clergy will become ever more important. The interesting differ-

ences among the variety of Christian traditions that are examined in this volume suggest that even greater insight could be gained from a comparative perspective that includes other faith traditions. Moreover, despite the range of Christian traditions covered here, some Christian traditions are vastly understudied. In particular, there has been too little systematic research on the political actions of Catholic parish priests and Protestant clergy from traditions other than the white mainline and the largest evangelical denominations.

In chapters 2 and 3, Jelen and Guth make a variety of calls for further research on clergy's political choices. Guth asks that more attention be paid to the socialization of clergy, the types of political activities in which clergy engage, and the political mobilization of clergy. Both Jelen and Guth call for more analysis of the consequences and effects of clergy action. Both also provide frameworks within which to study the consequences of clergy action. Guth articulates the need for analyses of consequences to take into account the long-term socialization of clergy, the effectiveness of mobilization efforts, the results of individual activism by clergy, and the effects clergy are able to have on public policy. Jelen provides a road map for future research in arguing that the effects of clergy action can be analyzed as reinforcement, agenda setting, or conversion.

Only one of these requests has been largely ignored in this volume: none of the chapters presents a systematic typology of clergy activities. This is left as a challenge for future research, but the volume's chapters do provide grist for the mill. A perusal of the chapters provides a good overview of the vast array of activities that would need to be included in such a typology.

Several chapters further our understanding of the political consequences of clergy socialization through analysis of gender expectations (chapter 4) and religious role expectations (chapters 5, 6, 9, and 10). But as Guth notes in chapter 3, much more work still needs to be done to uncover the influences of early family socialization, early socialization in church communities, and seminary socialization experiences. Guth finds little evidence of the effects of family background in his survey analysis of Southern Baptist clergy, but this still leaves open the possibility that more in-depth interview analysis could uncover interesting ways in which this early socialization influences later political choices.

In his chapter on Southern Baptist clergy, Guth heeds his own call for better analysis of the organizational mobilization of clergy. He examines mobi-

lization in one of the largest denominations in the United States, and he provides insight into how scholars could examine it in other religious traditions as well. Several of the other chapters also examine mobilization, and chapter 7 provides a method for indirect analysis of mobilization. But further research needs to be done to uncover how organizational mobilization works and the contexts in which clergy are most likely to be recruited into or linked to larger political organizations.

The consequence chapters in this volume include analyses of most of the consequences Guth and Jelen identify for study. They examine reinforcement, agenda setting, conversion (Fetzer chapter 11), and mobilization (Cavendish chapter 13), which are the potential consequences Jelen suggests. They also provide some evidence of long-term socialization (Fetzer chapter 11) and the efficacy of mobilization (Cavendish chapter 13), both of which Guth issues as challenges for future research. These two studies provide important insight into the consequences of clergy action in urban and Anabaptist contexts. They also demonstrate methods that others could use for research on the consequences of clergy's choices in other contexts. Such research is needed to help clergy and seminary educators learn more about how they can be most effective.

All three of the consequence chapters also examine the effects of clergy's political action on their followers. Nevertheless, research is still needed on the larger consequences of clergy action and particularly on its effects on public policy. Until such research is done, our understanding of the consequences of clergy action will remain limited to the effects clergy have on the political attitudes and actions of their followers. While opinion leadership and mobilization are of great significance in a democracy, they ignore a larger segment of what clergy do as community and national leaders. It is important to examine the full range of effects that clergy's political choices can have on the American democratic process.

Research about clergy's political action will also contribute to the understanding of the larger notion of political action by professionals (Crawford, Olson, and Deckman, forthcoming). Clergy are just one interesting example of professionals whose primary business is not politics but who are often drawn into politics in the course of doing their primary business. So much of policymaking, especially at the local level, occurs in quasi-governmental working groups of professionals or in the nonprofit sector, where profession-

als can have a substantial influence by serving on boards. Much more research needs to be done to understand how clergy, and other professionals, influence policy outcomes.

Ignoring the religious dimensions of American politics means ignoring a large portion of what goes on in activities as diverse as elections, protests, and day-to-day policymaking. In particular, it means ignoring the politics of some of the most hotly contested and divisive issues of the day and ignoring an important aspect of the moral dimension of political choices for many political actors. Although much is known about religion and politics thanks to studies of religious influences on public opinion, we can learn much more by examining the roles that clergy play in the nexus of religion and politics.

This volume highlights some of these roles. It also shows how the choices clergy make about accepting these roles, as well as the consequences of their choices, depend on the contexts in which they are socialized and the contexts in which they work. Clergy do not make these choices in a vacuum. Learning more about the social, religious, and political factors that influence their political decisions provides a deeper understanding of how these fascinating religious professionals come to shape politics, social movements, and citizens—and how their roles may change as their situations change. As this volume illustrates, there is much to be learned from scholars from all disciplines, and much that research on clergy can contribute to bodies of knowledge on broader social phenomena such as social movements, opinion leadership, and organizational politics. This volume begins an interdisciplinary discussion of clergy in politics. It is our hope that many others will join the discussion.

NOTES

1 | Clergy in Politics

1. For a historical account of the involvement of clergy in American politics, see Ahlstrom (1972).

2. While clergy in other religious traditions, such as Jewish rabbis and Muslim clerics, also make choices about whether to become involved in politics, no scholars were undertaking research on them at the time of the preparation of this volume.

3. Justice Stewart used this phrase to describe pornography in *Jacobellis* v. *Ohio* 378 U.S. 184 (1964).

2 | Notes for a Theory of Clergy as Political Leaders

1. In another example, televangelist Marion "Pat" Robertson has recently suggested that God might cause a natural (or supernatural) disaster to occur in Orlando, Florida, in response to the "gay friendly" policies of the Walt Disney Company.

2. Guth and colleagues (1997, 141) do use an item that reads, "Clergy of different faiths need to cooperate more in politics, even if they can't agree in theology." They find that large majorities of clergy across levels of orthodoxy agree with this statement. But a more rigorous test of the particularism hypothesis might involve asking about cooperation with members of specific denominations. Such items would be more pointed and potentially more controversial than a general question about cooperation. For an analogous discussion of political tolerance, see Prothro and Grigg (1960).

3. See "Baptist Crusade Takes Aim" (2000) for a description of conflict between Mormons and Southern Baptists.

4. Moreover, pastoral education may be a two-edged sword, with the potential to *suppress* the effectiveness of clergy's political leadership as well as enhance it. Finke and Stark (1992) have noted that the "professionalization" of clergy often leads to a decline in lay membership and participation.

5. This difference may be more apparent than real. Welch and colleagues (1993) report that evangelical ministers are more likely to preach on issues of personal morality, but with the exception of homelessness, mainline clergy are no more likely to preach on issues of peace or economic justice. Further, Catholic teaching from the pulpit is distinctive only with respect to issues of sexual morality, or what David Leege has termed "pelvic politics" (Leege and Kellstedt 1993).

6. I am indebted to John Green for this insight.

4 | Gender and the Political Choices of Women Clergy

We would like to thank all the women clergy who so graciously shared time and experiences with us to make this research possible. We would also like to thank the participants in the Clergy in Politics: Choices and Consequences conference held at Creighton University for their helpful suggestions, and Joleen Richwine for assistance with transcription. This study was partially funded by a Creighton University Graduate School Summer Faculty Development grant and funds from the Creighton University Center for the Study of Religion and Society.

1. These are not the only religious traditions that ordain women. Women clergy also serve in Christian traditions such as the Quakers (Friends), as well as in some Pentecostal and other evangelical traditions. Our sample therefore represents one subset of women clergy: those serving in mainline Protestant denominations and in progressive Jewish traditions.

2. We selected a sample in each city from lists of women clergy provided by denominational offices. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) office in Washington, D.C., however, did not provide a list of women ministers, so we used the telephone book. This means that smaller Presbyterian churches, which may not have placed an advertisement naming their ministers in the yellow pages, may not have been included in the list from which the sample was drawn.

5 | Theocratic, Prophetic, and Ecumenical

This chapter is dedicated to the memory of my mother, Polly Kentfield Sawyer.

1. The term *black church* is conventionally used to refer to all traditional black denominations, African American congregations in predominantly white denominations, and African American Catholics. In essence, the term refers to the body of black Christian believers.

2. The leadership of the civil rights movement reflected the patriarchy of the black church. Not until the women's movement of the 1970s did significant numbers of African American women begin to be admitted to the ranks of clergy. Even today, black women constitute a disproportionately smaller proportion of the American ministry than do white women, a circumstance partially attributable to the fact that many black Baptist churches still decline to ordain women.

6 | The Construction of Political Strategies among African American Clergy

I would like to thank Lutheran Brotherhood and the Fund for Theological Education for grants that made this research possible.

1. Saul Alinsky was the founder of the Industrial Areas Foundation. This national network now includes more than fifty community organizations throughout the country and continues to grow. It has spawned other, smaller networks (such as the Chicago-based Gamaliel Foundation) that also use the Alinsky model to mobilize faith-based organizations for community development activity. See Alinsky (1946/1969).

7 | Clergy as Political Actors in Urban Contexts

1. Data on clergy's activities come from a self-administered mail survey sent to a random sample of clergy serving in the Indianapolis metropolitan area in 1993. The return rate was 27 percent, yielding a final sample size of 186 respondents, including black and white Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergy. The low return rate and the single-city sample raise concerns about the generalizability of our results. It is nonetheless useful to develop and test hypotheses about the mobilizing mechanisms that lead clergy in this sample who serve in low-income neighborhoods to participate at higher levels than their colleagues. It is important to develop hypotheses that link context to political behavior and methods to test these hypotheses, to provide means for other scholars to examine the links between context and political behavior. Our results also contribute to scholarly debate even if they must be seen as preliminary, because few other scholars besides those who do case study research have explored the relationship between neighborhood context and clergy's political choices (Olson and Jelen 1998).

2. All measures utilized in the present analysis have been calculated for the specific neighborhood surrounding each minister's primary congregation. The income level of neighborhood residents is measured by a five-point index that combines the unemployment rate, the percentage living below the poverty line, and the percentage of residents receiving public assistance.

3. We test our statistical models with Poisson regression, a form of multiple regression that is appropriate for analyses in which the dependent variable is a count of activities (Haight 1967; Johnson and Kotz 1969; King 1988, 1989). King (1988) argues persuasively that Poisson regression offers a more appropriate form of analysis for this

type of data than does ordinary least squares regression (OLS) or logged OLS. Tests of clergy participation models with a negative binomial regression provide further evidence that the Poisson model is the appropriate functional form.

4. The incident rate ratio suggests that each increment in the five-point low-income index results in an expected 13 percent increase in the rate of clergy activities.

5. In this dummy variable, clergy who indicate that they were either called to their congregation or placed there by their denomination with an explicit expectation of involvement in activities outside of religious education and worship are assigned a value of 1, while other clergy have a value of 0. Clergy who were called or assigned to their jobs with this expectation might be more likely to find themselves working in low-income areas, where there might be greater perceptions of need for clergy to participate in community work.

6. The membership encouragement index measures the extent to which new and longtime members encourage clergy to take part in activities outside of religious education and worship. A five-point scale that measures the extent to which members encourage community activities is very weakly correlated with the five-point low-income index ($r = 0.13$). Moreover, membership encouragement is not statistically or substantively significant when added to the model for participation.

7. The measure is a three-point index created from 1990 census data reports of resident occupations.

8. The incident rate ratio $= 0.77$ ($p < 0.001$).

9. $r = -0.66$.

8 | American Church or Church in America?

1. Even Vatican II, an ecumenical council that emphasized other aspects of the Church's life, held in its *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* that "the faithful" must exercise a "religious submission of will and mind . . . in a special way to the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking [infallibly]" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 48). In even clearer language, Catholic canon law holds that "[t]here is neither appeal nor recourse against a decision or decree of the Roman Pontiff" (Canon Law Society of America 1983, 119).

2. Canon law is clear on this point. The bishops' "functions of teaching and ruling . . . by their very nature . . . can be exercised only when they are in hierarchical communion with the head of the college and its members" (Canon Law Society of America 1983, 139).

3. In its *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church,* Vatican II was explicit about both the "collegial nature and meaning of the episcopal order," and the degree to which

"bishops appointed the world over were linked with each other and with the Bishop of Rome" (Abbott and Gallagher 1966, 42).

4. I first made this point in *Catholic Bishops in American Politics* (Byrnes 1991, 38–53).

5. In one poll, 75 percent of Polish respondents said that the Church "should not engage in politics" (FBIS-EEU, 22 September 1995).

6. Sometimes the bishops' political positioning is still as clear as it was in 1989. During Poland's 1995 presidential campaign, for example—an election ultimately won by Aleksander Kwasniewski, a former Communist minister—the Church's choices and political leanings were clear to all. They argued: "Voters should not support candidates who participated in the exercise of power at the highest party and government levels under totalitarian rule" (FBIS-EEU, 30 August 1995).

9 | The Mobilization of a Religious Elite

1. The ten-page survey was sent to one thousand Southern Baptist clergy chosen randomly from the list of "pastors" in the *Southern Baptist Convention Annual 1996*. After three mailings, the survey elicited 361 responses from ministers at 880 currently valid addresses, for a response rate of 41 percent. To check on possible response biases, I compared respondents to a profile of Southern Baptist clergy produced by the denomination and discovered that survey respondents are slightly better educated than the clergy as a whole but do not differ substantially in other ways. To check whether respondents might more interested in politics than nonrespondents, I incorporated a variable in the final model in table 9.2 that measures the rapidity with which respondents returned their questionnaires. The variable was not a significant predictor of general activism; ministers who responded quickly to the first letter were no more active than were those responding tardily to the third letter requesting their participation. Thus, it is unlikely than nonrespondents would be markedly different than those who participated in the survey.

2. The political participation items used in this index are considerably more numerous than those in most studies of clergy politics, which tend to stress either political activity within the ministerial role or, alternatively, "citizen" acts (see Beatty and Walter 1989; Quinley 1974). The inventory includes writing a letter to the editor; circulating a petition; contacting a public official; publicly endorsing a candidate; endorsing a candidate from the pulpit; taking a public stand on an issue; taking a pulpit stand on an issue; preaching an entire sermon on an issue; touching on an issue in a sermon; forming a church political action group; forming a church political study group; participating in a boycott; organizing voter registration; distributing voter

guides; campaigning for candidates (three separate variables); protesting; committing civil disobedience; running for public office; giving money to a candidate, political action committee, or political party; joining a national political group; praying publicly for a candidate; and attempting to persuade someone to vote for a particular candidate or party. The alpha reliability coefficient for this index is 0.85.

3. The alpha reliability coefficient for the orthodoxy index is 0.89; for the dispensationalism index, 0.83; and for the civic gospel index, 0.78.

4. The *individual political activity* score is an additive index of responses to questions on how strongly pastors approved or disapproved of clergy engaging in thirteen distinct political activities, ranging from preaching a sermon on a political issue to committing civil disobedience. The *denominational activism* index consists of three items: preference for denominational activism, church-based lobbying activity, and the effect of political activity on churches. The alpha reliability coefficients for these measures are 0.85 and 0.68, respectively.

5. The *party performance* score is the unrotated principal component of an analysis using twelve items that ask which party would do a better job dealing with twelve issues: maintaining family values, aiding the poor, protecting the environment, providing for national defense, representing minorities, maintaining economic growth, raising personal morality, supporting free speech, fighting crime, giving people more voice in government, maintaining freedom of religion, and helping senior citizens. The first component has an Eigenvalue of 7.02. It accounts for 58 percent of the variance and has a theta reliability coefficient of 0.93.

6. The *moral reform agenda* and *social justice agenda* scores measure the attention paid by ministers to public issues and are the result of a principal components analysis of twenty issues. The operation produced two sizable components. The first has an Eigenvalue of 6.83 and accounts for 34 percent of the variance, while the second has an Eigenvalue of 2.31 and accounts for another 12 percent of the variance. A varimax rotation produced a clear moral reform factor made up of items on abortion, pornography, prayer in schools, the death penalty, family issues, gay rights, education, gambling, and alcohol. The social justice factor consists of items on the ERA and civil rights; concern toward Russia, Latin America, and Africa; and attention to defense spending, the economy, unemployment, and the environment. Each has a theta reliability coefficient of 0.85.

7. The *ideological liberalism* and *conservatism* measures were produced by a principal components analysis of twenty-one issue items. The first component has an Eigenvalue of 6.67 and accounts for 33 percent of the total variance; all items except two (the deficit and Mideast policy) had loadings of at least 0.40 on the first component. Four other minor components each accounted for less than 6 percent of the variance.

Thus I used the unrotated first component as a measure of issue ideology. The theta reliability coefficient for this measure is 0.89. (The correlation with self-identified ideology is 0.70.) To allow for the possibility that ministers at both ends of the ideological spectrum might be more active, I split the score at its midpoint, producing the ideological conservatism and liberalism measures used in the text. I incorporated these measures in the multivariate analysis rather than ideological self-identification, as they have a greater range.

8. As ministers' ratings of their congregations' reactions to activism track their own quite closely, I used pastors' approval scores to predict congregational ones in a simple regression, and used the residual to test the unique component of congregational attitudes (the part that differs from the pastor's attitude).

9. I also calculated a score based on ministers' assessment of the differences between their views and their congregations' on twenty-one political issues, but the five-point ideological difference scale actually worked a little better.

10. It might be surprising to see that the correlation between activism and religious television use is so weak. Few Southern Baptist ministers get much information from religious television (16 percent), which is dominated by the Pentecostal, charismatic, and independent Baptist strains of evangelicalism (long anathema to Southern Baptists).

10 | Reformed Preachers in Politics

1. These eight denominations included the Assemblies of God, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Evangelical Covenant Church, the Christian Reformed Church, the Reformed Church in America, the United Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and the Disciples of Christ (Christian Church).

2. There are several other reasons to study clergy in these two denominations. First, they are of interest because of their age and heritage; the RCA is the nation's oldest Protestant denomination and the Reformed (Calvinist) theology of both denominations has much in common with the theology of some of America's earliest nonnative settlers, including the Pilgrims. Second, these denominations are of interest because their Reformed theology stresses that God is sovereign over all of life including its social and political aspects. Consequently, those in the Reformed tradition have been less inclined than those in other Christian traditions to view politics as reflecting primarily the sinful nature of humanity—and less inclined to respond to this viewpoint's associated call to abandon the political realm.

3. Despite operating within different institutional networks, however, both fall in the moderate or middle range on religious orthodoxy indices. They fall between the

more conservative elements of the evangelical camp and the more liberal elements of the mainline or modernist camp (Guth et al. 1997).

4. In 1990 the RCA claimed approximately 363,000 members, while the total membership for the CRC in 1990 was 226,000. See Newman and Halvorson (2000, 132–35).

5. While other questions could be incorporated within such an orthodoxy index (on topics such as the virgin birth or the physical resurrection of Jesus), we used this three-item index in order to provide comparability to the analysis of clergy political participation provided in *The Bully Pulpit.*

6. For this activity, there are no comparable data to report from *The Bully Pulpit.*

11 | Shaping Pacifism

A more extended version of this chapter was presented at the 1992 meetings of the American Political Science Association in Chicago and of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion in Washington, D.C., where it received SSSR's student paper award. I am indebted to J. Howard Kauffman and the Institute of Mennonite Studies for graciously providing me with the data from their 1989 survey; to Donald P. Green, John F. Connors III, Sue E. S. Crawford, Deborah L. Guber, J. Howard Kauffman, Lyman Kellstedt, David Leege, Juan Linz, Katie McDermott, Laura R. Olson, James C. Scott, Rogers M. Smith, and J. Christopher Soper for their helpful comments on the manuscript; to Joan G. Fetzer, Carl F. Fetzer, Marvin P. Foreman, Edna A. Foreman, Ann Gerken, David Jelinek, Gregory A. Mouning, and Donald W. Roth for their help with data acquisition and computer programming; and especially to the many pastors and parishioners who took part in the survey discussed in this chapter. I am also grateful for research support provided by Yale University's Department of Political Science and the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program. In addition, Kauffman's data collection was funded by the participating denominations and by the Mennonite Mutual Aid Association, Mennonite Central Committee, Schowalter Foundation, DeFehr Foundation, and Brotherhood Mutual Insurance Company. I am nonetheless solely responsible for the analyses and interpretations in this chapter.

1. Using stratified sampling to ensure representativeness, the investigators eventually obtained usable responses from 3,083 church members belonging to 153 different Anabaptist congregations. Approximately 85 percent of the eligible and selected congregations agreed to participate, and about 70 percent of the eligible and selected members of those churches returned a usable questionnaire (Kauffman and Driedger 1991, 274–76). Most respondents completed the questionnaire at their local church on a prearranged evening (Kauffman and Harder 1975, 366). Fortunately for my purposes, the pastors at each of these locations also filled out a questionnaire (Kauffman and

Harder 1975, 376). For a more detailed discussion of Kauffman's methodology, see Kauffman and Driedger (1991, 273–77) and Kauffman and Harder (1975, 364–85).

2. Correlations between any two questions vary from 0.268 to 0.573 among ministers and from 0.157 to 0.603 among lay respondents. Correlations between an individual question and the pacifism scale range from 0.608 to 0.802 among pastors and from 0.552 to 0.808 among parishioners.

3. The regression equation reported in table 11.1 is for individuals. On average, however, a whole congregation will move one way or the other depending on the views of the pastor. If all individuals in a congregation move in the same direction "in formation," the whole congregation will perforce also have moved.

4. In addition, one might suspect that table 11.1 underestimates pastoral influence by failing to control for the size of the congregation. (For a related analysis by congregational size, see Penning and Smidt chapter 10.) If one adds size and an interaction term between size and pastoral pacifism, however, the estimate for pastoral pacifism remains almost unchanged ($b = 0.322$; $SE = 0.059$; $p < 0.001$). And neither size itself ($b = -0.033$; $SE = 0.045$; $p > 0.05$) nor the interaction term ($b = -0.002$; $SE = 0.003$; $p > 0.05$) has any statistically significant effect on parishioners' pacifism.

5. Data on how long a given pastor had served in her or his current congregation came directly from denominational officials (for the Evangelical Mennonite Church) or were derived indirectly by determining the year of the denominational directory (such as *Mennonite Yearbook*) in which the particular pastor first appeared (for all other denominations).

6. $b = 0.259$; $SE = 0.029$; $p < 0.001$.

7. $b = 0.009$; $SE = 0.003$; $p < 0.05$.

8. $b = -0.166$; $SE = 0.057$; $p < 0.05$.

9. Of course, someone raised in an Anabaptist denomination might abandon pacifism, but she or he would likely find intolerable the almost unavoidable Anabaptist peace message and therefore leave the denomination—and Kauffman's sample—entirely.

10. $b = 0.310$; $SE = 0.027$; $p < 0.001$. Both parents of a respondent who had been "raised Anabaptist" had belonged to their current Anabaptist denomination when she or he was growing up.

11. The instrumental variables deal with how well the pastor got along with his or her spouse, number of children, age at first marriage, size of household, frequency of avoiding unhealthful foods, and what type, if any, of mutual fund, retirement plan, auto insurance, and health insurance the pastor had. Only in the most outlandish scenario would a potential parishioner or pastoral search committee choose a church or pastor based on these characteristics. Indeed, many of these traits would remain un-

known even to the most active church members. These instrumental variables should therefore satisfy the key assumption that they are correlated with the possibly endogenous regressor (they are) but uncorrelated with the disturbance.

12. $b = 0.502$; $SE = 0.050$; $p < 0.001$. I calculated the standard error according to the specifications of Hout (1977). That the estimate is stronger after correction for bidirectional causation may appear strange. What likely occurred, however, is that imprecision in the measure of the pastor's pacifism (*random measurement error,* which tends to make estimates too weak) was an even bigger problem than two-way causation (which can make estimates too strong). The instrumental-variables technique corrects for random measurement error as well as bidirectional causation.

13. $b = 0.075$; $SE = 0.142$; $p > 0.05$.

14. $b = -1.741$; $SE = 2.834$; $p > 0.05$.

15. $b = 0.270$; $SE = 0.095$; $p < 0.05$.

16. The pacifism variable ranges from 10 to 27.

17. The pacifism variable ranges from 6 to 24.

18. $b = 0.326$; $SE = 0.056$; $p < 0.001$; $N = 143$.

19. I am grateful to Deborah Guber for raising this issue.

20. Arriving at a precise figure for the amount of money the five denominations spend each year helping their clergy spread the peace message would be extremely difficult. The figure must nonetheless run in at least the hundreds of thousands of dollars. In the Mennonite Church, for example, the Peace and Justice Committee reported an annual budget of around $50,000 for North American operations (personal communication with the Mennonite Church Peace and Justice Committee). George R. Brunk III, the dean of Eastern Mennonite Seminary (personal communication), estimates that roughly 25 percent of the curriculum at Mennonite Church seminaries (Eastern Mennonite Seminary and Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary) consists of some form of peace theology. According to Brunk, the annual cost to provide this instruction to Mennonite pastoral candidates at his seminary amounts to approximately $800,000. To these figures must be added the expense of candidates' previous peace-related education at Mennonite colleges and universities. (Brunk indicates that about 75 percent of Eastern Mennonite Seminary's students had graduated from Mennonite undergraduate institutions.) Brunk further notes that some regional Mennonite districts (for example, the Virginia Conference of the Mennonite Church) also allocate some of their annual budget for advocating peace. Finally, roughly 25 percent of publications by Herald Press (the denomination's publishing house) forward a peace message (Herald Press, personal communication).

12 | Cardinal O'Connor and His Constituents

I would like to thank Valerie Hoekstra, Bob Salisbury, Laura Olson, Sue Crawford, and two other reviewers for their assistance and comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. They, of course, can claim credit for some of its insights but bear responsibility for none of its missteps and mistakes.

1. The data were made available to Washington University, ICPSR #9457. Neither Washington University nor the ICPSR are responsible for the use and interpretation of the data employed here.

2. For questions involving a binary choice, ordinary least squares estimators bring a number of undesirable qualities to the process, often including estimates beyond the 0 to 1 bounds (Hanushek and Jackson 1977). Therefore logit, a maximum likelihood estimator, is a more appropriate choice.

13 | To March or Not to March

This research was supported by a grant from the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion and by the Constant H. Jacquet Award from the Religious Research Association. The author wishes to thank Mark Chaves, Kevin Christiano, David Leege, Michael Welch, and the participants in the Clergy in Politics: Choices and Consequences conference held at Creighton University for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

1. In one instance, the priests forcibly entered a south side store to demonstrate against the sale of drug paraphernalia. Although they were arrested on account of their action, their public protests and the support they generated inspired the Illinois General Assembly to pass a bill that bans the sale and purchase of drug-use implements, such as marijuana roach clips and pipes (Karwath 1989).

2. See Verba et al. (1993b, 457) for a description of this function of clergy.

3. Churchgoers might even seek out such political stimuli, Welch and colleagues (1993) reason, because they, like most people, seek guidance from outside sources in making decisions about difficult or complex social realities. According to these authors, if congregation members are unsure, for example, about how to apply abstract religious doctrines to the difficult political decisions they face, they may welcome the insights or suggestions offered to them by their church leaders.

4. Up to that point, most of the conclusions regarding the effects of political stimuli on congregational responses had been speculative. For example, studies that observed a positive relationship between church attendance and political behavior made

inferences about the possible mediating role of political cues offered in the church setting. In this sense, Welch and colleagues' (1993) study has made a significant contribution to the literature.

5. Specifically, Welch and colleagues (1993) found some statistically significant, though modest, relationships. Evangelical Protestants who remember cues from their clergy on issues such as abortion, proper sexual behavior, prayer in schools, and homelessness do tend to take positions that correspond with those of their clergy. Catholics who remember cues from their clergy on issues such as housing and homelessness also tend to adopt similar positions.

6. Some studies do provide a basis for speculating about the influence of political cues on actual political participation. Wald, Owen, and Hill (1988), for instance, demonstrate a positive relationship between religious involvement (principally church attendance) and voter turnout. (See also Wald 1997, 35–38, for a complete listing of recent studies showing this relationship.) One might infer from this and other studies that political cue-giving is one of the mechanisms that explain the relationship. But because these studies lack direct measures of exposure to political cues (like cues about the importance of voting), whatever they say about the possible mediating role of political stimuli is best regarded as speculative or suggestive.

7. Because it would be impossible for respondents who joined St. Sabina before 1989 (when the church first announced its war on drugs) to have known about its political activities before joining, I restricted my analysis of these items to those whose attendance postdates the 1989 protest activities ($N = 71$).

8. $p = 0.258$.

9. $p = 0.961$.

10. $p = 0.0001$.

11. I asked this question of only my first fifty-eight respondents. In the interest of shortening the length of the interviews, I decided to ask this question and two others of only a subsample of my respondents.

12. Answers were reported on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = "agree strongly" to 5 = "disagree strongly."

13. $p = 0.021$.

14. Answers were reported on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = "agree strongly" to 5 = "disagree strongly." Although this question does not specifically address the Friday night marches, because the marches are a key component of the ministry program, one can infer from this question a general level of commitment to the marches.

15. $p = 0.265$.

16. These answers were content-coded based on which of the three categories respondents fell into. If respondents mentioned that the marches were beneficial for cau-

tioning liquor store owners against selling drug paraphernalia or alcohol to minors, or for keeping drug dealers on notice, or for raising the community's awareness and consciousness of the problems of drugs and violence, then respondents were believed to subscribe to a sociopolitical understanding of the marches. If respondents indicated that the marches were beneficial for sharing Christ's love to people on the streets, or for inviting drug dealers and prostitutes to come to church, then respondents were believed to subscribe to a religious understanding. If respondents stated both sociopolitical and religious functions they were coded in yet a third category.

17. $p = 0.0002$.

18. Ancillary analyses using bivariate analyses (or cross-tabulations) showed that each of the attitudinal variables in model 2 was significantly correlated with participation in the marches. While 67.5 percent of those with high levels of efficacy joined the marches, only 36.8 percent of those with low levels of efficacy reported likewise. While 72.7 percent of those who agreed strongly that participation was required for membership joined the marches, only 26.7 percent of those who did not agree joined. And approximately 80 percent of those who adopt the "evangelization frame" compared to only 42.2 percent of those who subscribe to the "sociopolitical frame" become so active.

19. I confirmed this finding about the importance of religious themes (or frames) for mobilizing churchgoers for social action through my interviews with Chicago-based community organizers who try to mobilize through churches. For instance, one community organizer who tries to mobilize Hispanic congregations for antidrug activism on the northwest side of Chicago stated that he enjoys the most success when he tells church members that they will have an opportunity to "pray the rosary" as they march outside of crack houses (personal interview A, 22 September 1995).

14 | Choices and Consequences in Context

1. See Tocqueville 1840/1969 for a discussion of the historical roots of this point. See also Fowler, Hertzke, and Olson 1999; Guth et al. 1997; Olson 2000.

This page intentionally left blank

REFERENCES

Abbott, Walter M., and Joseph Gallagher, eds. 1966. *The Documents of Vatican II.* Piscataway, NJ: Association Press.

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. 1972. *A Religious History of the American People.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Alinsky, Saul David. 1946/1969. *Reveille for Radicals.* New York: Vintage.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 1987. *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

———. 1990. *Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Appleby, R. Scott. 1997. "Catholics and the Christian Right: An Uneasy Alliance." In *Sojourners in the Wilderness: The Christian Right in Comparative Perspective,* ed. Corwin E. Smidt and James M. Penning. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Baer, Hans A. 1988. "Black Mainstream Churches: Emancipatory or Accommodative Responses to Racism and Social Stratification in American Society?" *Review of Religious Research* 30: 162–76.

Baer, Hans A., and Merrill Singer. 1992. *African-American Religion in the Twentieth Century: Varieties of Protest and Accommodation.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Balmer, Randall H. 1996. *Grant Us Courage: Travels along the Mainline of American Protestantism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

"Baptist Crusade Takes Aim at Mormons, Other 'Cults'." *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (23 January 2000): 9A.

Bass, Harold F. 1991. "Background to Debate: A Reader's Guide and Bibliography." In *The End of Realignment? Interpreting American Electoral Eras,* ed. Byron E. Shafer. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Beatty, Kathleen Murphy, and Oliver Walter. 1989. "A Group Theory of Religion and Politics: The Clergy as Group Leaders." *Western Political Quarterly* 42: 129–46.

Beck, Paul Allen, and M. Kent Jennings. 1979. "Political Periods and Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 73: 737–50.

Benson, Peter L., and Dorothy L. Williams. 1982. *Religion on Capitol Hill: Myths and Realities.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Berkowitz, Laura, and John C. Green. 1997. "Charting the Coalition: The Local Chapters of the Ohio Christian Coalition." In *Sojourners in the Wilderness: The Christian Right in Comparative Perspective,* ed. Corwin E. Smidt and James M. Penning. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Birrell, W. D., J. E. Greer, and D. J. D. Roche. 1979. "The Political Role and Influence of the Clergy in Northern Ireland." *Sociological Review* 27: 491–512.

Blanshard, Paul. 1958. *American Freedom and Catholic Power,* 2d ed. Boston: Beacon.

Bowden, Roger J., and Darrell A. Turkington. 1984. *Instrumental Variables.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boyer, Paul S. 1992. *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89: 271–94.

Bromley, David G., ed. 1988. *Falling from the Faith: Causes and Consequences of Religious Apostasy.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Broom, Jack. 1966. "The Negro Church and the Movement for Equality." Master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Browne, William P. 1995. "Organized Interests, Grassroots Confidants, and Congress." In *Interest Group Politics,* 4th ed., ed. Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A. Loomis. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Brozan, Nadine. 1989. "O'Connor Proposes Order of Nuns to Fight Abortion and Euthanasia." *New York Times* (November 4): A31.

Brunk, Gregory G., Donald Secrest, and Howard Tamashiro. 1996. *Understanding Attitudes About War: Modeling Moral Judgments.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bryan, Mike. 1991. *Chapter and Verse: A Skeptic Revisits Christianity.* New York: Random House.

Buell, Emmett H., and Lee Sigelman. 1985. "An Army That Meets Every Sunday: Popular Support for the Moral Majority in 1980." *Social Science Quarterly* 66: 426–34.

———. 1987. "A Second Look at 'Popular Support for the Moral Majority in 1980: A Second Look.'" *Social Science Quarterly* 68: 167–69.

Burkett, Randall K. 1997. "The Baptist Church in Years of Crisis: J. C. Austin and Pilgrim Baptist Church, 1926–1950." In *African-American Religion: Interpretive Essays in History and Culture,* ed. Timothy E. Fulop and Albert J. Raboteau. New York: Routledge.

Burtt, Harold E., and Don R. Falkenberg. 1941. "The Influence of Majority and Expert Opinion on Religious Attitudes." *Journal of Social Psychology* 14: 269–78.

Byrnes, Timothy A. 1991. *Catholic Bishops in American Politics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1996. "The Catholic Church and Poland's Return to Europe." *East European Quarterly* 30: 433–48.

Campbell, Ernest Q., and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 1959. *Christians in Racial Crisis: A Study of Little Rock's Ministry.* Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.

Campolo, Tony. 1995. *Can Mainline Denominations Make a Comeback?* Valley Forge, PA: Judson.

Canon Law Society of America. 1983. *Code of Canon Law: Latin-English Edition.* Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America.

Carmines, Edward G., and James A. Stimson. 1980. "The Two Faces of Issue Voting." *American Political Science Review* 74: 78–91.

Carroll, Jackson W., Barbara Hargrove, and Adair T. Lummis. 1983. *Women of the Cloth: A New Opportunity for the Churches.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Carroll, Jackson W., Barbara G. Wheeler, Daniel O. Aleshire, and Penny Long Marler. 1997. *Being There: Culture and Formation in Two Theological Schools.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Carter, Stephen L. 1993. *The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion.* New York: Basic Books.

Casanova, Jose. 1994. *Public Religions in the Modern World.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cavendish, James C. 1997. "African-American Religion and the Mobilization of Community Activism: Congregations as Recruiting Agents." Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame.

Chandler, Marthe A., Elizabeth Adell Cook, Ted G. Jelen, and Clyde Wilcox. 1994. "Abortion in the United States and Canada: A Comparative Study of Public Opinion." In *Abortion Politics in the United States and Canada: Studies in Public Opinion,* ed. Ted G. Jelen and Marthe A. Chandler. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Chang, Patricia M. Y. 1997. "Female Clergy in the Contemporary Protestant Church: A Current Assessment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36: 565–73.

Chapman, Audrey R. 1991. *Faith, Power, and Politics: Political Ministry in Mainline Churches.* New York: Pilgrim.

Chaves, Mark. 1997. *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chaves, Mark, and Lynn M. Higgins. 1992. "Comparing the Community Involvement of Black and White Congregations." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 31: 425–40.

Cherry, Conrad. 1995. *Hurrying Toward Zion: Universities, Divinity Schools, and American Protestantism.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Clark, Peter B., and James Q. Wilson. 1961. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6: 129–66.

Cone, James H. 1984. *For My People: Black Theology and the Black Church.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Conway, M. Margaret. 1991. *Political Participation in the United States,* 2d ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Cook, Elizabeth Adell, Ted G. Jelen, and Clyde Wilcox. 1993. "Catholicism and Abortion Attitudes in the American States: A Contextual Analysis." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32: 223–30.

Crawford, Sue E. S. 1995. "Clergy at Work in the Secular City." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University.

Crawford, Sue E. S., Avra J. Johnson, and David Swindell, with Lydia Amerson, Roger B. Parks, and David Robb. 1994. "Turning Toward Neighborhoods: A Preliminary Report." Publication no. 94-U31, Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, Indiana University.

Crawford, Sue E. S., Laura R. Olson, and Melissa M. Deckman. Forthcoming."Understanding the Mobilization of Professionals." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.*

Crawford, Thomas J. 1974. "Sermons on Racial Tolerance and the Parish Neighborhood Context." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 4: 1–23.

Cross, Robert D. 1958. *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dahl, Robert A. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Davidson, James D., C. Lincoln Johnson, and Alan K. Mock. 1990. *Faith and Social Ministry: Ten Christian Perspectives.* Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Davidson, James D., Andrea S. Williams, Richard A. Lamanna, Jan Stenftenagel, Kathleen Maas Weigert, William J. Whalen, and Patricia Wittberg. 1997. *The Search for Common Ground: What Unites and Divides Catholic Americans.* Huntingdon, IN: Our Sunday Visitor.

Day, Donna C. (Katie). Forthcoming. *Prelude to Struggle: African American Clergy and Community Organizing for Economic Development.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

DeBenedetti, Charles. 1990. *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Demerath, N. J., and Rhys H. Williams. 1992. *A Bridging of Faiths: Religion and Politics in a New England City.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

DiMaggio, Paul J., John H. Evans, and Bethany Bryson. 1996. "Have Americans' Social Attitudes Become More Polarized?" *American Journal of Sociology* 102: 690–755.

Djupe, Paul A. 1997. "The Plural Church: Church Involvement and Political Behavior." Ph.D. diss., Washington University in St. Louis.

———. 2000. "Religious Brand Loyalty and Political Loyalties." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 39: 78–89.

Djupe, Paul A., and Christopher P. Gilbert. 1999. "The Political Voice of Clergy." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA.

Dobson, Edward G. 1996. "Taking Politics Out of the Sanctuary." *Christianity Today* 40 (May 20): 16–17.

Dohen, Dorothy. 1967. *Nationalism and American Catholicism.* New York: Sheed and Ward.

Dolan, Jay P. 1992. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903/1969. *The Souls of Black Folk.* New York: New American Library.

Dudley, Carl S. 1991. "From Typical Church to Social Ministry: A Study of the Elements Which Mobilize Congregations." *Review of Religious Research* 32: 195–212.

Ellis, John Tracy, ed. 1987. *Documents of American Catholic History.* Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier.

Erickson, Joseph A. 1992. "Adolescent Religious Development and Commitment: A Structural Equation Model of the Role of Family, Peer Group, and Educational Influences." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 31: 131–52.

Falwell, Jerry. 1980. *Listen, America!* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 1992. "The Political Context of Rationality: Rational Choice Theory and Resource Mobilization." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory,* ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Festinger, Leon, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter. 1956. *When Prophecy Fails.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Findlay, James F. 1993. *Church People in the Struggle: The National Council of Churches and the Black Freedom Movement, 1950–1970.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 1992. *The Churching of America, 1776–1990: Winners and Losers in our Religious Economy.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Finlay, Barbara. 1997. "Future Ministers and Legal Abortion: Gender Comparisons among Protestant Seminary Students." *Women and Politics* 17: 1–15.

Fleming, G. James. 1968. "The Negro Church and Politics." *Risk* 4: 1–29.

Fogarty, Gerald P. 1982. *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965.* Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS-EEU). 1995.

Fowler, Robert Booth, Allen D. Hertzke, and Laura R. Olson. 1999. *Religion and Politics in America: Faith, Culture, and Strategic Choices,* 2d ed. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Frazier, E. Franklin. 1964. *The Negro Church in America.* New York: Schocken.

Freedman, Samuel G. 1993. *Upon this Rock: The Miracles of a Black Church.* New York: HarperCollins.

Freeman, Roland L. 1990. "Philadelphia's African Americans: A Celebration of Life." *National Geographic* 178 (August): 66–91.

Friedland, Michael B. 1998. *Lift Up Your Voice Like a Trumpet: White Clergy and the Civil Rights and Antiwar Movements, 1954–1973.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Fuechtmann, Thomas G. 1989. *Steeples and Stacks: Religion and Steel Crisis in Youngstown.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Genovese, Eugene D. 1974. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made.* New York: Pantheon.

Gilbert, Christopher P. 1993. *The Impact of Churches on Political Behavior: An Empirical Study.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Glanton, A. Dahleen, and Jerry Thornton. 1989. "Two Priests Targeting Drug Paraphernalia." *Chicago Tribune* (September 4): 6M.

Glendon, Mary Ann. 1991. *Rights Talk: The Impoverishment of Political Discourse.* New York: Free Press.

Glock, Charles Y., and Benjamin B. Ringer. 1956. "Church Policy and the Attitudes of Ministers and Parishioners on Social Issues." *American Sociological Review* 21: 148–56.

Glock, Charles Y., Benjamin B. Ringer, and Earl R. Babbie. 1967. *To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goldman, Ari L. 1990. "O'Connor Warns Politicians Risk Excommunication over Abortion." *New York Times* (June 15): A1.

———. 1991. *The Search for God at Harvard.* New York: Times Books.

Goldsmith, Stephen. 1994. "End the Welfare Delivery Monopoly." *Wall Street Journal* (August 23): A12.

Graber Miller, Keith. 1996. *Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves: American Mennonites Engage Washington.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1977. *The American Catholic: A Social Portrait.* New York: Basic Books.

Green, John C. 1993. "Pat Robertson and the Latest Crusade: Religious Resources and the 1988 Presidential Campaign." *Social Science Quarterly* 74: 157–68.

Green, TeResa C. 1997. "Black Sermons and African-American Political Mobilization." Ph.D. diss., Wayne State University.

Grindstaff, Laura. 1994. "Abortion and the Popular Press: Mapping Media Discourse from *Roe* to *Webster.*" In *Abortion Politics in the United States and Canada: Stud-*

ies in Public Opinion, ed. Ted G. Jelen and Marthe A. Chandler. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1963. *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Guth, James L. 1984. "The Politics of Preachers: Southern Baptist Ministers and Christian Right Activism." In *New Christian Politics,* ed. David G. Bromley and Anson Shupe. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

———. 1989. "Southern Baptists and the New Right." In *Religion in American Politics,* ed. Charles W. Dunn. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

———. 1996. "The Bully Pulpit: Southern Baptist Clergy and Political Activism, 1980–1992." In *Religion and the Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front,* ed. John C. Green, James L. Guth, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Guth, James L., John C. Green, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Corwin E. Smidt. 1995. "Onward Christian Soldiers: Religious Activist Groups in American Politics." In *Interest Group Politics,* 4th ed., ed. Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A. Loomis. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Guth, James L., John C. Green, Margaret M. Poloma, and Corwin E. Smidt. 1991. "Pulpits and Politics: The Protestant Clergy in the 1988 Presidential Election." In *The Bible and the Ballot Box: Religion and Politics in the 1988 Election,* ed. James L. Guth and John C. Green. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Guth, James L., John C. Green, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt. 1994. "Women Clergy and the Political Transformation of Mainline Protestantism." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Social Science History Association, Atlanta, GA.

Guth, James L., John C. Green, Corwin E. Smidt, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Margaret M. Poloma. 1997. *The Bully Pulpit: The Politics of Protestant Clergy.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Guth, James L., and Lyman Kellstedt. 1997. "The Mobilization of a Religious Elite: Political Activism among Southern Baptist Clergy in 1996." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

Guth, James L., Lyman A. Kellstedt, Corwin E. Smidt, and John C. Green. 1998. "Thunder on the Right: Religious Interest Group Mobilization in the 1996 Election." In *Interest Group Politics,* 5th ed., ed. Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A. Loomis. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Hadaway, C. Kirk, Penny Long Marler, and Mark Chaves. 1993. "What the Polls Don't Show: A Closer Look at U.S. Church Attendance." *American Sociological Review* 58: 741–52.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. 1969. *The Gathering Storm in the Churches.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Haight, Frank A. 1967. *Handbook of the Poisson Distribution.* New York: Wiley.

Hailey, Mel. 1988. "The Political and Social Attitudes of Church of Christ Ministers." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA.

Hall, Carla. 1985. "Bill Gray, Baron of the Budget: The Committee Chairman in His Hour of Triumph." *Washington Post* (May 24): B1.

Hall, Mitchell. 1992. "CALCAV and Religious Opposition to the Vietnam War." In *Give Peace a Chance: Exploring the Vietnam Antiwar Movement,* ed. Melvin Small and William D. Hoover. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Hamil-Luker, Jenifer, and Christian Smith. 1998. "Religious Authority and Public Opinion on the Right to Die." *Sociology of Religion* 59: 373–91.

Hamilton, Charles V. 1972. *The Black Preacher in America.* New York: Morrow.

Hammond, Philip E., Luis Salinas, and Douglas Sloane. 1978. "Types of Clergy Authority: Their Measurement, Location, and Effects." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 17: 241–53.

Hanushek, Eric A., and John E. Jackson. 1977. *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists.* New York: Academic Press.

Harris, Fredrick C. 1999. *Something Within: Religion in African-American Political Activism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Harris, Margaret. 1995. "Quiet Care: Welfare Work and Religious Congregations." *Journal of Social Policy* 24: 53–71.

Hartmann, George W. 1941. "Motivational Differences Between Pacifists and Non-Pacifists." *Journal of Social Psychology* 14: 197–210.

Hayes, Jeffrey. 1995. "Pre-existing Social Networks and the Christian Right." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

Hershberger, Guy F. 1944. *War, Peace, and Nonresistance.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Hertzke, Allen D. 1988. *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

———. 1993. *Echoes of Discontent: Jesse Jackson, Pat Robertson, and the Resurgence of Populism.* Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Hinkle, Don. 1998. "Pastor, Deacons Lead Protest Against Books Promoting Homosexuality." *Baptist Press Release* 5-129-98.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home.* New York: Viking.

Hodgkinson, Virginia A., Murray S. Weitzman, and Arthur D. Kirsch. 1993. *From Belief to Commitment: The Community Service Activities and Finances of Religious Congregations in the United States, 1993.* Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Hofrenning, Daniel J. B. 1995. *In Washington but Not of It: The Prophetic Politics of Religious Lobbyists.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hoge, Dean R. 1976. *Division in the Protestant House: The Basic Reasons behind Intra-Church Conflicts.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Hornblower, Margot. 1985. "Homes, Hope Rising From N.Y. Rubble: Brooklyn Rebuilds on Work and Faith." *Washington Post* (July 12): A1.

Hostetler, John Andrew. 1954. *The Sociology of Mennonite Evangelism.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Hougland, James G., and James R. Wood. 1979. "Determinants of Organizational Control in Local Churches." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 18: 132–45.

Hout, Michael. 1977. "A Cautionary Note on the Use of Two-Stage Least Squares." *Sociological Methods and Research* 5: 335–46.

Howard-Pitney, David. 1990. *The Afro-American Jeremiad: Appeals for Justice in America.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Huckfeldt, Robert. 1986. *Politics in Context: Assimilation and Conflict in Urban Neighborhoods.* New York: Agathon.

Huckfeldt, Robert, Paul Allen Beck, Russell J. Dalton, and Jeffrey Levine. 1995. "Political Environments, Cohesive Social Groups, and the Communication of Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 39: 1025–54.

Huckfeldt, Robert, Eric Plutzer, and John Sprague. 1993. "Alternative Contexts of Political Behavior: Churches, Neighborhoods, and Individuals." *Journal of Politics* 55: 365–81.

Huckfeldt, Robert, and John Sprague. 1987. "Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information." *American Political Science Review* 81: 1197–1216.

———. 1995. *Citizens, Politics, and Social Communications: Information and Influence in an Election Campaign.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, Richard T. 1996. *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hunter, James Davison. 1991. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 1994. *Before the Shooting Begins: Searching for Democracy in America's Culture War.* New York: Free Press.

Hunter, James Davison, and Kimon Howland Sargeant. 1993. "Religion, Women, and the Transformation of Public Culture." *Social Research* 60: 545–70.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Hurwitz, Jon, and Mark Peffley. 1987. "How Are Foreign Policy Attitudes Structured? A Hierarchical Model." *American Political Science Review* 81: 1099–1120.

Iannaccone, Laurence R. 1994. "Why Strict Churches Are Strong." *American Journal of Sociology* 99: 1180–1211.

Ice, Martha Long. 1987. *Clergy Women and Their Worldviews: Calling for a New Age.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Jaccard, James, Robert Turrisi, and Choi K. Wan. 1990. *Interaction Effects in Multiple Regression.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jelen, Ted G. 1991. *The Political Mobilization of Religious Beliefs.* New York: Praeger.

———. 1992a. "The Clergy and Abortion." *Review of Religious Research* 34: 132–51.

———. 1992b. "Political Christianity: A Contextual Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 692–714.

———. 1993. *The Political World of the Clergy.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

———. 1994a. "Protestant Clergy as Political Leaders: Theological Limitations." *Review of Religious Research* 36: 23–42.

———. 1994b. "Religion and Foreign Policy Attitudes: Exploring the Effects of Denomination and Doctrine." *American Politics Quarterly* 22: 382–400.

———. 1995. "Review of Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America.*" *Review of Religious Research* 36: 315–17.

———. 1998a. "God or Country: Debating Religion in Public Life." In *Moral Controversies in American Politics: Cases in Social Regulatory Policy,* ed. Raymond Tatalovich and Byron W. Daynes. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

———. 1998b. "Research in Religion and Mass Political Behavior in the United States: Looking Both Ways after Two Decades of Scholarship." *American Politics Quarterly* 26: 110–34.

Jelen, Ted G., and Clyde Wilcox. 1998. "Context and Conscience: The Catholic Church as an Agent of Political Socialization in Western Europe." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37: 28–40.

Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1981. *Generations and Politics: A Panel Study of Young Adults and their Parents.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Johnson, Benton. 1964. "Ascetic Protestantism and Political Preference in the Deep South." *American Journal of Sociology* 69: 359–66.

———. 1966. "Theology and Party Preference among Protestant Clergymen." *American Sociological Review* 31: 200–208.

———. 1967. "Theology and the Position of Pastors on Public Issues." *American Sociological Review* 32: 433–42.

———. 1998. "Theology and the Position of Pastors on Social Issues: Continuity and Change Since the 1960s." *Review of Religious Research* 39: 293–308.

Johnson, Norman L., and Samuel Kotz. 1969. *Discrete Distributions.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Johnstone, Ronald. 1971. "Negro Preachers Take Sides." In *The Black Church in America,* ed. Hart M. Nelsen, Raytha L. Yokley, and Anne K. Nelsen. New York: Basic Books.

Karwath, Rob. 1989. "Anti-drug Paraphernalia Bill Gets Thompson's OK." *Chicago Tribune* (August 23): 2C.

Kauffman, J. Howard, and Leo Driedger. 1991. *The Mennonite Mosaic: Identity and Modernization.* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Kauffman, J. Howard, and Leland Harder. 1975. *Anabaptists Four Centuries Later: A Profile of Four Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Denominations.* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

———. 1989. *Church Member Profile II: A Study of Members in Five Denominations* [questionnaire]. Goshen, IN: J. Howard Kauffman and Institute of Mennonite Studies.

Kauffman, J. Howard, and Institute of Mennonite Studies. 1989. *Church Member Profile II* [computer file]. Goshen, IN: J. Howard Kauffman and Institute of Mennonite Studies.

Kellstedt, Lyman A. 1989. "The Meaning and Measurement of Evangelicalism: Problems and Prospects." In *Religion and Political Behavior in the United States,* ed. Ted G. Jelen. New York: Praeger.

Kellstedt, Lyman A., and Corwin E. Smidt. 1993. "Doctrinal Beliefs and Political Behavior: Views of the Bible." In *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics,* ed. David C. Leege and Lyman A. Kellstedt. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Kelly, George A. 1982. *The Crisis of Authority: John Paul II and the American Bishops.* Chicago: Regnery.

———. 1989. *Inside My Father's House.* New York: Doubleday.

Kendall, Patricia L., and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. 1950. "Problems of Survey Analysis." In *Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of "The American Soldier,"* ed. Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. New York: Free Press.

Kern, Kathleen. 1998. "Campaign for Secure Dwellings." *Mennonite* (March 17): 13.

Kerr, Norbert L. 1996. "'Does My Contribution Matter?' Efficacy in Social Dilemmas." In *European Review of Social Psychology,* vol. 7, ed. Wolfgang Stoebe and Miles Hewstone. New York: Wiley.

Kilson, Martin. 1971. "Political Change in the Negro Ghetto, 1900–1940s." In *Key Issues in the Afro-American Experience,* vol. 2, ed. Nathan I. Huggins, Martin Kilson, and Daniel M. Fox. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

King, Gary. 1988. "Statistical Models for Political Science Event Counts: Bias in Conventional Procedures and Evidence for the Exponential Poisson Regression Model." *American Journal of Political Science* 32: 838–63.

———. 1989. *Unifying Political Methodology: The Likelihood Theory of Statistical Inference.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

King, Robert. 1997. "Pastor Feels Duty-Bound to Denounce Homosexuality." *Greenville News* (April 25): 1B.

Kingdon, John W. 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies.* Boston: Little, Brown.

———. 1989. *Congressmen's Voting Decisions,* 3d ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Klassen, Sue. 1998. "Gardens of Justice in Barren Places." *Mennonite* (March 17): 12.

Koller, Norman B., and Joseph D. Retzer. 1980. "The Sounds of Silence Revisited." *Sociological Analysis* 41: 155–61.

Kordesh, Richard. 1986. "Democracy from Above and Below: The Reorganization of Neighborhood Politics." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University.

Kosela, Krzysztof. 1990. "The Polish Catholic Church and the Elections of 1989." *Religion in Communist Lands* 18: 124–37.

Kotler-Berkowitz, Laurence A. 1998a. "Shaping Contextual Effects on Electoral Behavior: The Role of Protestant Clergy in the United States and Great Britain." Presented at the Clergy in Politics: Choices and Consequences conference, Creighton University, Omaha.

———. 1998b. "Structuring Electoral Behavior: Religious Contexts in the United States and Great Britain." Ph.D. diss., Brown University.

Ladd, Everett Carll, and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1975. *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Langenbach, Lisa, and John C. Green. 1992. "Hollow Core: Evangelical Clergy and the 1988 Robertson Campaign." *Polity* 25: 147–58.

Lay Commission on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy. 1984. *Towards the Future: Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy.* New York: Lay Commission on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy.

Leege, David C., and Joseph Gremillion. 1986. "The People, Their Pastors, and the Church: Viewpoints on Church Policies and Positions." *Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life,* Report no. 7. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Leege, David C., and Lyman A. Kellstedt, eds. 1993. *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Lehman, Edward C. 1985. *Women Clergy: Breaking Through Gender Barriers.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

———. 1993. *Gender and Work: The Case of the Clergy.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Leland, John. 1998. "Savior of the Streets." *Newsweek* (June 1): 20–29.

Lincoln, C. Eric. 1972. "Foreword to the C. Eric Lincoln Series in Black Religion." In *Black Sects and Cults,* ed. Joseph R. Washington. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Lincoln, C. Eric, and Lawrence H. Mamiya. 1990. *The Black Church in the African American Experience.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Luidens, Donald A., and Roger J. Nemeth. 1989. "After the Storm: Closing the Clergy-Laity Gap." *Review of Religious Research* 31: 183–95.

Luttbeg, Norman R., and Harmon Zeigler. 1966. "Attitude Consensus and Conflict in an Interest Group: An Assessment of Cohesion." *American Political Science Review* 60: 655–66.

Lynch, James R. 1997. "Christian Peacemaking Teams: Opportunities for Active Peacemaking." In *Sustaining Peace Witness in the Twenty-First Century: Papers from the 1997 Quaker Peace Roundtable,* ed. Charles E. Fager. Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Issues Program.

Marable, Manning. 1983. *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems in Race, Political Economy, and Society.* Boston: South End.

Marx, Gary T. 1967. "Religion: Opiate or Inspiration of Civil Rights Militancy among Negroes?" *American Sociological Review* 32: 64–72.

———. 1969. *Protest and Predjudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community.* New York: Harper and Row.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McAvoy, Thomas T. 1957. *The Great Crisis in American Catholic History, 1895–1900.* Chicago: Regnery.

McCord, Julia. 1997. "Pastor's Trial May Be Crossroads for Church." *Omaha World-Herald* (March 8): 1A.

———. 1999. "Creech Loses Credentials." *Omaha World-Herald* (November 18): 1A.

McGreevy, John T. 1996. *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McGuire, William J. 1985. "Attitudes and Attitude Change." In *Handbook of Social Psychology,* 3d ed., vol. 2, ed. Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. New York: Random House.

McMahon, Eileen. 1995. *What Parish Are You From? A Chicago Irish Community and Race Relations.* Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

McNamara, Patrick H. 1992. *Conscience First, Tradition Second: A Study of Young American Catholics.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mickey, Thomas J. 1980. "Social Order and Preaching." *Social Compass* 27: 347–62.

Milbrath, Lester W. 1963. *The Washington Lobbyists.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, and Oksana Malanchuk. 1981. "Group Consciousness and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science* 25: 494–511.

Miller, Krystal. 1993. "More Black Churches Go into Business." *Wall Street Journal* (January 27): B1.

Moen, Matthew C. 1992. *The Transformation of the Christian Right.* Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Morawska, Ewa. 1995. "The Polish Roman Catholic Church Unbound: Change of Face or Change of Context?" In *Can Europe Work? Germany and the Reconstruction of Postcommunist Societies,* ed. Stephen E. Hanson and Willfried Spohn. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Morken, Hubert. 1994. "Compromise: The Thinking Behind Colorado's Amendment 2 Strategy." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York.

Morris, Aldon D. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change.* New York: Free Press.

———. 1992. "Political Consciousness and Collective Action." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory,* ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Morris, Aldon D., and Carol McClurg Mueller, eds. 1992. *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Moses, Wilson Jeremiah. 1982. *Black Messiahs and Uncle Toms: Social and Literary Manipulations of a Religious Myth.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

———. 1990. *The Wings of Ethiopia: Studies in African-American Life and Letters.* Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Mueller, Carol McClurg. 1992. "Building Social Movement Theory." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory,* ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Murphy, Andrew M. 1993. "The Mainline Churches and Political Activism: The Continuing Impact of the Persian Gulf War." *Soundings* 76: 526–49.

Murphy, Steven E. 1972. "A Note on Clergy-Laity Differences among Lutherans." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 11: 177–79.

Murray, John Courtney. 1960. *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition.* New York: Sheed and Ward.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. 1975. *A Pastoral Plan for Pro-Life Activities.*

Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, U.S. Catholic Conference.

National Task Force on African-American Men and Boys. 1996. *Repairing the Breach: Key Ways to Support Family Life, Reclaim Our Streets, and Rebuild Civil Society in America's Communities.* Dillon, CO: Alpine Guild.

Nelsen, Hart M., and Sandra Baxter. 1981. "Ministers Speak on Watergate: Effects of Clergy Role during Political Crisis." *Review of Religious Research* 23: 150–66.

Nelsen, Hart M., and Nelsen, Anne K. 1975. *Black Church in the Sixties.* Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Nesmith, Bruce. 1994. *The New Republican Coalition: The Reagan Campaigns and White Evangelicals.* New York: P. Lang.

New York Times Editor. 1990. "O'Connor and Press." *New York Times* (March 24): A9.

Newman, William M., and Peter L. Halvorson. 2000. *Atlas of American Religion: The Denominational Era, 1776–1990.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Nexon, David. 1971. "Asymmetry in the Political System: Occasional Activists in the Republican and Democratic Parties, 1956–1964." *American Political Science Review* 65: 716–30.

Niebuhr, Gustav. 1999. "U.S. Bishops Urging Catholics to Be Politically Involved." *New York Times* (October 20): A18.

Nolan, Hugh J., ed. 1984. *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops.* Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, U.S. Catholic Conference.

O'Connor, John. 1990. "O'Connor: 'The Real Issue.'" *New York Times* (February 1): B4.

O'Hara, Delia. 1994. "Mass Appeal: Preacher Transcends Racial Differences." *Chicago Sun-Times* (November 13): 1.

Olson, Laura R. 1994. "The Implications of Issue Definition among Protestant Clergy." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Social Science History Association, Atlanta, GA.

———. 1997. "The Impact of Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status on the Political Participation of Protestant Clergy." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

———. 2000. *Filled With Spirit and Power: Protestant Clergy in Politics.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Olson, Laura R., Sue E. S. Crawford, Melissa M. Deckman, and Christi J. Braun. 1998. "Issue and Action Agendas of Women Clergy in Politics." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.

Olson, Laura R., and Ted G. Jelen. 1998. *The Religious Dimension of Political Behavior: A Critical Analysis and Annotated Bibliography.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Osa, Maryjane. 1989. "Resistance, Persistence, and Change: The Transformation of the Catholic Church in Poland," *East European Politics and Societies* 3: 290–99.

———. 1996. "Pastoral Mobilization and Contention: The Religious Foundations of the Solidarity Movement in Poland." In *Disruptive Religion: The Force of Faith in Social-Movement Activism,* ed. Christian Smith. New York: Routledge.

Pallone, Nathaniel J. 1965. "Explorations in Religious Authority and Social Perception I: The Collar and Conformity." *Acta Psychologica* 22: 321–27.

———. 1966. "Religious Authority and Social Perception: A Laboratory Exploration in Social Influence." *Journal of Social Psychology* 68: 229–41.

Pallone, Nathaniel J., and Francis A. Yeandel. 1968. "Religious Influence and Social Perception II: The Clear Triumph of Religious over Military Authority." *Journal of Social Psychology* 75: 147–54.

Paltrow, Scot J. 1986. "Poland and the Pope: The Vatican's Relations with Poland, 1978 to the Present," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 15: 1–26.

Paris, Peter J. 1985. *The Social Teaching of the Black Churches.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

———. 1995. *The Spirituality of African Peoples: The Search for a Common Moral Discourse.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

Peachey, Titus. 1993. *Silence and Courage: Income Taxes, War and Mennonites 1940–1993.* MCC Occasional Paper no. 18. Akron, PA: Mennonite Central Committee.

Penning, James M. 1998. "The Christian Right in Michigan: From Social Movement to Organized Interest?" Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

Penning, James M., and Corwin E. Smidt. 2000. "The Political Activities of Reformed Clergy in the United States and Scotland." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 39: 204–19.

Peterson, Steven A. 1992. "Church Participation and Political Participation: The Spillover Effect." *American Politics Quarterly* 20: 123–39.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 1996. *The Diminishing Divide: American Churches, American Politics.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.

Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail.* New York: Vintage.

"Preacher Behind Disney Boycott Goes on Trial Today." *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (July 7, 1997): 7A.

Pressley, Sue Anne. 1995. "Texans Band to Thwart Religious Influence." *Washington Post* (November 7): A3.

Price, Dennis L., W. Robert Terry, and B. Conrad Johnston. 1980. "The Measurement of the Effect of Preaching and Preaching plus Small Group Dialogue in One Baptist Church." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 19: 186–97.

Prothro, James W., and Charles M. Grigg. 1960. "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement." *Journal of Politics* 22: 276–94.

Pulley, Brett. 1997. "Whitman Seen Gaining Favor of Black Clergy." *New York Times* (October 23): A1.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6: 65–78.

Quinley, Harold E. 1974. *The Prophetic Clergy: Social Activism among Protestant Ministers.* New York: Wiley.

Ramet, Sabrina P. 1998. *Nihil Obstat: Religion, Politics, and Social Change in East-Central Europe and Russia.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Reed, Ralph. 1994. *Politically Incorrect: The Emerging Faith Factor in American Politics.* Dallas: Word.

———. 1996. *Active Faith: How Christians Are Changing the Soul of American Politics.* New York: Free Press.

Reese, Thomas J. 1996. *Inside the Vatican: The Politics and Organization of the Catholic Church.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reichley, A. James. 1985. *Religion in American Public Life.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Roof, Wade Clark, and William McKinney. 1987. *American Mainline Religion: Its Changing Shape and Future.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Roozen, David A., William McKinney, and Jackson W. Carroll. 1984. *Varieties of Religious Presence: Mission in Public Life.* New York: Pilgrim.

Rose, Richard. 1971. *Governing Without Consensus: An Irish Perspective.* Boston: Beacon.

Rosenstone, Steven J., and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America.* New York: Macmillan.

Russo, Ed, and Fred Knapp. 1994. "Religion, Politics, Mix in Some Churches." *Lincoln Journal-Star* (September 6): 10.

Ruth-Heffelbower, Duane. 1991. *The Anabaptists Are Back: Making Peace in a Dangerous World.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Ryden, David. 1998. "The Religious Community's Participation in Welfare Reform: A Comparative Case Study." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.

Salisbury, Robert H. 1992. *Interests and Institutions: Substance and Structure in American Politics.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sapiro, Virginia. 1983. *The Political Integration of Women: Roles, Socialization, and Politics.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Sapp, William D. 1975. "Factors in the Involvement of Southern Baptist Pastors in Governmental Decision-Making." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Sawyer, Mary R. 1994. *Black Ecumenism: Implementing the Demands of Justice.* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Schaller, Lyle E. 1990. "Megachurch!" *Christianity Today* (March 5): 20–24.

Schuller, David S., Merton P. Strommen, and Milo L. Brekke, eds. 1980. *Ministry in America: A Complete Report and Analysis.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Scott, Andrew M., and Margaret A. Hunt. 1966. *Congress and Lobbies: Images and Realities.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Segers, Mary C. 1995. "The Catholic Church as a Political Actor." In *Perspectives on the Politics of Abortion,* ed. Ted G. Jelen. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Shaw, Talbert O. 1973. "Responsibility and Black Middle-Class Religion." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago.

Shenk, Steve. 1991. "MCC Board Calls for Cease-Fire in Gulf War." *Gospel Herald* (February 12): 9–10.

Shie, Paul C. J. 1991. "Why the Robertson Campaign Failed: A Study of Political Mobilization of Evangelical Ministers in the 1988 Republican Presidential Primaries." Ph.D. diss., University of Kansas.

Shingles, Richard D. 1981. "Black Consciousness and Political Participation: The Missing Link." *American Political Science Review* 75: 76–91.

Sigel, Roberta S., ed. 1989. *Political Learning in Adulthood: A Sourcebook of Theory and Research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sigelman, Lee, Clyde Wilcox, and Emmett H. Buell. 1987. "An Unchanging Minority: Popular Support for the Moral Majority, 1980 and 1984." *Social Science Quarterly* 68: 876–84.

Smidt, Corwin E. 1983. "Born-Again Politics: The Political Behavior of Evangelical Christians in the South and Non-South." In *Religion and Politics in the South: Mass and Elite Perspectives,* ed. Tod A. Baker, Robert P. Steed, and Laurence W. Moreland. New York: Praeger.

Smith, Christian. 1991. *The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Christian, ed. 1996. *Disruptive Religion: The Force of Faith in Social-Movement Activism.* New York: Routledge.

Smith, R. Drew. 1996. "African-American Protestants, Political Activism, and 'Liberal' Redemptive Hopes." *Theology Today* 53: 191–200.

Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." In *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research across Cultures,* ed. Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney G. Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

———. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory,* ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51: 464–81.

Stark, Rodney. 1980. "Comment: On Buying Back Youthful Daubings." *Sociological Analysis* 41: 162–63.

Stark, Rodney, Bruce D. Foster, Charles Y. Glock, and Harold E. Quinley. 1971. *Wayward Shepherds: Prejudice and the Protestant Clergy.* New York: Harper and Row.

Stark, Rodney, and Charles Y. Glock. 1968. *American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sundquist, James L. 1983. *The Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Szajkowski, Bogdan. 1983. *Next to God—Poland: Politics and Religion in Contemporary Poland.* London: F. Pinter.

Tamney, Joseph B., and Stephen D. Johnson. 1985. "Christianity and the Nuclear Issue." *Sociological Analysis* 46: 321–28.

Tanner, Norman P., ed. 1990. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Teixeira, Ruy A. 1992. *The Disappearing American Voter.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1840/1969. *Democracy in America.* New York: Vintage.

Towns, Elmer L. 1990. *Ten of Today's Most Innovative Churches.* Ventura, CA: Regal.

Turner, Ronny E. 1973. "The Black Minister: Uncle Tom or Abolitionist?" *Phylon* 34: 86–95.

Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry E. Brady, and Norman H. Nie. 1993a. "Citizen Activity: Who Participates? What Do They Say?" *American Political Science Review* 87: 303–18.

———. 1993b. "Race, Ethnicity, and Political Resources: Participation in the United States." *British Journal of Political Science* 23: 453–97.

Verhovek, Sam Howe. 1990. "Cardinal Defends a Jailed Bishop Who Warned Cuomo on Abortion." *New York Times* (February 1): A1.

Vidich, Arthur J., and Joseph Bensman. 1968. *Small Town in Mass Society: Class, Power, and Religion in a Rural Community.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

WABC/*New York Daily News.* 1990. WABC/*New York Daily News* Cardinal O'Connor Poll [computer file]. Radnor, PA: Chilton Research Services [producer]; Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].

Wald, Kenneth D. 1992. "Religious Elites and Public Opinion: The Impact of the Bishops' Peace Pastoral." *Review of Politics* 54: 112–43.

———. 1997. *Religion and Politics in the United States,* 3d ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis E. Owen, and Samuel S. Hill. 1988. "Churches as Political Communities." *American Political Science Review* 82: 531–48.

———. 1990. "Political Cohesion in Churches." *Journal of Politics* 52: 197–215.

Walsh, Edward. 1998. "Gambling's Election Win: Industry's Influence Felt in Several States." *Washington Post* (November 6): A1.

Walton, Hanes. 1985. *Invisible Politics: Black Political Behavior.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ware, Alan. 1985. *The Breakdown of Democratic Party Organization, 1940–1980.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Welch, Michael R., David C. Leege, Kenneth D. Wald, and Lyman A. Kellstedt. 1993. "Are the Sheep Hearing the Shepherds? Cue Preceptions, Congregational Responses, and Political Communication Processes." In *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics,* ed. David C. Leege and Lyman A. Kellstedt. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Wentz, Richard E. 1990. *Religion in the New World: The Shaping of Religious Traditions in the United States.* Minneapolis: Fortress.

West, Cornel. 1982. *Prophecy Deliverance! An Afro-American Revolutionary Christianity.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Wilcox, Clyde. 1987. "Popular Support for the Moral Majority in 1980: A Second Look." *Social Science Quarterly* 68: 157–66.

———. 1992. *God's Warriors: The Christian Right in Twentieth-Century America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wilcox, Clyde, Sharon Linzey, and Ted G. Jelen. 1991. "Reluctant Warriors: Premillennialism and Politics in the Moral Majority." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30: 245–58.

Wilcox, Clyde, Mark J. Rozell, and Roland Gunn. 1996. "Religious Coalitions in the New Christian Right." *Social Science Quarterly* 77: 543–58.

Williams, Rhys H., ed. 1997. *Cultural Wars in American Politics: Critical Reviews of a Popular Myth.* New York: Aldine.

Wilmore, Gayraud S. 1998. *Black Religion and Black Radicalism: An Interpretation of the Religious History of Afro-American People,* 3d ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wineburg, Robert J. 1992. "Local Human Services Provision by Religious Congregations: A Community Analysis." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quaterly* 21: 107–18.

Wood, James R. 1970. "Authority and Controversial Policy: The Churches and Civil Rights." *American Sociological Review* 35: 1057–69.

———. 1981. *Leadership in Voluntary Organizations: The Controversy over Social Action in Protestant Churches.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Wood, Richard L. 1997. "Social Capital and Political Culture: God Meets Politics in the Inner City." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40: 595–605.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Yoder, John Howard. 1972. *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Zikmund, Barbara Brown, Adair T. Lummis, and Patricia M.Y. Chang. 1998. *Clergy Women: An Uphill Calling.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Zwier, Robert. 1982. *Born-Again Politics: The New Christian Right in America.* Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity.

This page intentionally left blank

CONTRIBUTORS

CHRISTI J. BRAUN, a political science graduate of Creighton University, is currently a student at Boston University School of Law. She served as a research assistant on a project on the political participation of women clergy with Sue Crawford.

TIMOTHY A. BYRNES is associate professor of political science at Colgate University. He has a strong research background in religion and politics, with a special emphasis on the Catholic Church. He is best known for his book *Catholic Bishops in American Politics,* but he is also the coeditor of *The Catholic Church and the Politics of Abortion* and *Abortion Politics in American States.* His articles have appeared such journals as *Political Science Quarterly,* the *Journal of Church and State, American Review of Politics, East European Quarterly,* and *Religion, State, and Society.* He has also written several chapters on religion and politics for edited volumes.

JAMES C. CAVENDISH is assistant professor of sociology at the University of South Florida. His research and publications heavily emphasize the study of religion and community. He conducted a major study of how African American congregations mobilize for community activism. He has published articles, in journals including the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* that examine an interesting mix of religious topics, including the effects of social networks on religiosity for black and white Catholics, the ordination of women, Catholic church attendance, and Christian communities in Brazil and Chile.

SUE E. S. CRAWFORD is assistant professor of political science at Creighton University. Her training and research emphasize the study of public policy in local and institutional contexts. Her work has included a study of clergy involvement in local public policy in Indianapolis, which was funded in part by the Lilly Endowment. With Laura Olson and Melissa Deckman, she is currently engaged in a multicity study of the political attitudes and actions

of women clergy. She has published on institutional analysis, local policy, and religion and politics in the *American Political Science Review, Research in Public Administration,* the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* and *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.*

KATIE DAY is professor of church and society at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. She has had extensive experience in social science research, theological education, and applied ministry. Her forthcoming *Prelude to Struggle: African American Clergy and the Resurgence in Community Organizing for Economic Development* is the result of a qualitative study of ten African American congregations in the impoverished neighborhoods of North Philadelphia. Day has published articles on congregational and clergy community outreach including articles in *The Living Pulpit* and the *Parish Practice Notebook.* She has served in three pastoral positions and as a research consultant for the Lilly Endowment and the Pew Charitable Trusts. Currently she has a research grant from the Lilly Endowment for a national study of burned African American churches and the volunteer rebuilding effort.

MELISSA M. DECKMAN is assistant professor of political science at Washington College. She has research experience and training in the study of religion and politics as well as the study of policy in local communities. Her previous work has explored the impact of the Christian Right on school board elections and policy. She has published in *Public Administration Review, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* and the *American Review of Politics.* With Laura Olson and Sue Crawford, she is currently engaged in a multicity study of the political attitudes and actions of women clergy.

PAUL A. DJUPE is assistant professor of political science at Denison University. His training and research combine expertise in religion and in the study of social context to understand citizen political behavior. His previous work has examined the nature of religious influence on political behavior, specifically how clergy, fellow congregation members, and church groups affect the political atti-

tudes and behaviors of church members. He is coauthor of *Religious Institutions and Minor Party Politics in the United States.* His current research with Christopher Gilbert is funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation and examines the nature of clergy political action and religious influence on the political behavior of church members. He is also coediting *The Encyclopedia of American Religion and Politics* with Laura Olson.

JOEL S. FETZER is assistant professor of political science at Central Michigan University. He specializes in immigration politics and religion and political behavior in the United States and Western Europe. His publications include *Public Attitudes toward Immigration in the United States, France, and Germany,* a coauthored chapter in *Prayers in the Precincts: The Christian Right in the 1998 Elections,* and an article in the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion.* With J. Christopher Soper, he is currently studying the integration of Muslim immigrants in England, France, and Germany.

JAMES L. GUTH is William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor of Political Science at Furman University. He has published more than fifty articles on religion in scholarly journals and edited volumes. In addition, he has contributed numerous articles for general interest publications such as *Christian Century* and *First Things.* Guth has received research support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and the Lilly Endowment, for his work on religion and politics. Guth is one of the so-called "Gang of Four," a group of four political scientists who have collaborated to publish a large volume of research examining the interplay between religion and politics. Among their many publications is a recent book on clergy in politics, *The Bully Pulpit: The Politics of Protestant Clergy.*

TED G. JELEN is professor and chair of political science at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. He has written extensively about the interplay between religion and politics, having published several books and numerous articles in scholarly journals. His 1993 book,

The Political World of the Clergy, is among the few recent studies of clergy in politics. Jelen's professional activity includes journal contributions and conference participation in the political science community as well as involvement in interdisciplinary conferences and scholarly communities. He has served as book review editor for the *Review of Religious Research* and is currently the editor of the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion.*

LAURA R. OLSON is assistant professor of political science at Clemson University. Her research and publications focus on the relationships between religion and politics. She was a postdoctoral research fellow at Princeton University's Center for the Study of Religion in 1999–2000. Her recent *Filled With Spirit and Power: Protestant Clergy in Politics* is an in-depth study of the political activities of Protestant clergy in Milwaukee. In addition to several book chapters and articles, she is coauthor of a volume on religion and political behavior entitled *The Religious Dimension of Political Behavior* and the second edition of *Religion and Politics in America.* She is currently engaged in a multicity study, with Sue Crawford and Melissa Deckman, of the political attitudes and actions of women clergy. She is also coediting *The Encyclopedia of American Religion and Politics* with Paul Djupe.

JAMES M. PENNING is professor of political science at Calvin College. His research training and publications emphasize the study of communities and religion. His dissertation and some of his early publications examined neighborhood and urban politics. Most of Penning's recent publications report results from research on religion and politics. He is coauthor of *Christian Political Action* and coeditor of *Sojourners in the Wilderness: The Christian Right in Comparative Perspective.* His journal publications on religion and politics appear in political science, sociology, and religious studies journals. Penning has also contributed to three edited volumes on religion in politics.

MARY R. SAWYER is associate professor of religious studies at Iowa State University. Her research experience includes serving as a research

associate for the Black Church in the African American Experience research project at Duke University, with principal investigators C. Eric Lincoln and Lawrence Mamiya. She contributed three chapters to the resulting book, *The Black Church in the African American Experience.* She has also served as the principal investigator of the Black Ecumenical Movements project at Iowa State University, which has resulted in numerous articles and a book, *Black Ecumenism: Implementing the Demands of Justice.* Many of the articles she has had published are based on research about religion in African American cultural settings; they have appeared in journals including *Review of Religious Research, Church History,* and the *Journal of Religious Thought.*

CORWIN E. SMIDT is Paul Henry Chair in Christianity and Politics and executive director of the Paul Henry Institute for the Study of Christianity and Politics at Calvin College. He is one of the so-called "Gang of Four," a group of four political scientists who have collaborated to publish a large volume of research examining the interplay between religion and politics. Among their many publications is a recent book on clergy in politics, *The Bully Pulpit: The Politics of Protestant Clergy.* Smidt has also served as editor or coeditor of three books on the political activities of evangelicals: *Sojourners in the Wilderness: The Christian Right in Comparative Perspective, Religion and Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front,* and *Contemporary Evangelical Political Involvement: An Analysis and Assessment.* Smidt organizes and facilitates interdisciplinary discussions of religion and politics through his position as executive director of the Paul Henry Institute for the Study of Christianity and Politics.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX

abortion, 6, 12, 20, 23, 36, 37, 38, 51–52, 54, 61, 62, 63, 65, 123, 124, 125, 128, 131, 132, 133–34, 136, 142, 147, 155, 188, 192, 193, 194, 197–98, 200, 201, 202, 207, 231, 250 n. 5
affirmative action, 25, 79
African American clergy, 10, 12, 30, 38, 40, 42, 66–84, 85–103, 106, 192, 195, 231, 240 n. 1, 241 n. 1
African Methodist Episcopal Church, 72
age, influence of, on clergy activism, 141, 142, 168, 169, 171–72
agenda, political. *See* clergy, contextual influences on; clergy, influence of, on congregation
alcoholism. *See* substance abuse
Alinsky, Saul, 87
Alliance of Baptists, 149–50
American Baptist Churches, U.S.A., 49, 101. *See also* Baptists
American Family Association (AFA), 150, 152, 158–59, 231
Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 152
Anabaptists, 12, 177–86, 246 n. 1, 247 nn. 5, 9, 10, 248 n. 20
anti-Catholicism, 21, 126–27
antidrug activities, 13, 82, 203–23, 234, 235, 249 n. 1, 250 n. 16, 251 n. 19
anti-Semitism, 21
Assemblies of God, 34, 245 n. 1. *See also* Pentecostals
associate ministers, 49, 63, 64
Atlanta, Georgia, 73, 79
attendance at religious services, influence of, on activism, 7, 88, 113, 180, 182, 209, 210–11, 213, 215, 219–20, 223, 249 n. 4, 250 nn. 6, 7
attracting congregants, 113, 115, 117, 118–19, 189, 191, 193, 205, 209
Austin, Rev. J. C., 72
authority of clergy, 17, 22–23, 27, 58, 59, 60, 71, 85, 91, 93, 121, 122–23, 125, 137, 178, 188, 190, 228–29

Baptists, 49, 75, 77, 92, 95, 101, 240 n. 2, 245 n. 10. *See also* Cooperative Baptist Fellowship; Southern Baptist Convention
benefit exchange, 188–89, 191–202, 234
Bernardin, Joseph Cardinal, 133
birth control, 192, 194, 197–98, 200, 201
black church, 66–84, 85–103, 106, 195, 240 n. 1. *See also* African American clergy; *names of black church organizations*
Black Clergy Association (BCA), 86, 95
black liberation theology, 80–81, 82, 83
black nationalism, 69, 72
Black Theology Project, 81
Boston, Massachusetts, 12, 81, 133
boycotts, 73, 75, 76, 140, 152, 206, 243 n. 2
Bread for the World, 39–40, 152
Buchanan, Patrick, 37
Bush, George H. W., 15, 83

Calvinism, 159, 229, 245 n. 2. *See also* Reformed clergy
campaign, political. *See* electoral politics
campaign financing, 138
candidates, political. *See* electoral politics; political parties; *names of individual candidates*
Catholic Alliance, 24
Catholic Church. *See* Roman Catholic Church
Charitable Choice. *See* Federal Welfare Reform Act (1996)
Chicago, Illinois, 13, 72, 77, 133, 204–23, 235, 241 n. 1, 251 n. 19
children's issues, 51–52, 54
Christian Coalition, 18–19, 21, 24, 37, 40, 150, 152, 154, 158–59, 231
Christian Life Commission. *See* Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission
Christian Reformed Church (CRC), 156, 159–72, 229, 245 nn. 1, 2, 246 n. 4. *See also* Reformed clergy
Christian Right, 11, 15, 18–19, 20–21, 24, 34, 36, 40, 145, 149, 155, 156, 157–59, 161. *See also names of specific organizations*
Church of God in Christ, 101. *See also* Pentecostals
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 21, 28, 239 n. 3
Church of the Brethren, 178, 179, 180. *See also* Anabaptists

Citizens for Traditional Values, 158–59
citizenship, 8–9, 10, 11, 13, 15–16, 69, 71, 204, 209, 214–16, 219–20, 222, 227, 228, 229, 231, 238
civic gospel, 145, 154–55, 244 n. 3
civic skills, 13, 68, 71, 105–6, 144, 149, 235
civil disobedience, 36, 186, 244 n. 2
Civil Rights Act (1964), 76
civil rights movement, 8, 11, 12, 36, 38, 67, 75–76, 79, 83, 84, 98, 142, 158, 192, 214, 240 n. 2
clergy, contextual influences on: of city, 50, 55, 59, 156, 169, 170; of congregation, 4–5, 39, 107, 114–15, 118, 150–51, 154, 156, 157, 168, 185, 195 (*see also* clergy-laity gap; congregation; political activity of clergy); of denomination, 32, 39, 111, 117, 120–38, 150, 156, 187, 188, 192; of government, 107 (*see also* government); of national politics, 10, 19, 120–21, 123, 126–38, 147, 151–53, 156, 230–31 (*see also* interest groups; mobilization; organizational mobilization; Poland; political parties); of neighborhood, 10, 57, 86–87, 104–19, 168, 232, 241 nn. 1, 2 (*see also* socioeconomic status); of place of residence, 89–90, 102, 103, 105, 142, 143, 232
clergy, efficacy of, 34, 140, 143, 144, 154, 155, 251 n. 18
clergy, influence of, on congregations, 7, 12, 13, 15–16, 24–28, 30, 41–42, 66, 157, 165–66, 177–87, 195, 203–23, 227, 233, 236–37, 247 nn. 3, 4, 249 n. 3. *See also* mobilization; opinion leaders; political cues to laity from clergy; sermons; study groups
clergy, influence of, on politics, 5, 7–8, 30, 41, 42–43, 70, 71, 97–98, 99, 236, 237–38. *See also* opinion leaders; public statements by clergy
clergy-laity gap, 16, 26, 150, 151, 169, 170, 171, 191, 193, 195, 233–34, 245 n. 9. *See also* congregation; job approval of clergy
clientage politics, 71
Clinton, William J., 155, 161, 165
commercial development, 81, 88, 92, 93, 95, 100, 103
Communism, 126, 128–29, 135, 136–37, 243 n. 6
community boards, 39, 238
community development, 8, 10, 36, 84, 85–103, 104, 109, 110–19, 231, 241 n. 1; entrepreneurial, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 102, 103
community economic development (CED), 10, 85–103, 232
community organizing, 87–90, 91–92, 93, 94, 96, 97–98, 99, 102, 103, 241 n. 1
Concerned Women for America, 24
Cone, James, 80, 82
congregation: disapproval of clergy activities by, 4–5, 25, 58, 150, 151, 154, 193, 194, 197, 198, 200, 202, 234–35, 245 n. 8; efficacy of, 204, 212–14, 219, 220, 221–22, 237; neighborhood of, 86–87, 94–96, 101, 218, 221, 235 (*see also* clergy, contextual influences on); political learning in, 26–27, 68, 71, 228 (*see also* citizenship; civic skills); size of, 102–3, 150, 154
Congress, U.S., 8, 42, 70, 72, 73, 77, 79, 82, 86
Congressional Black Caucus, 79
Congress of National Black Churches (CNBC), 81, 82
conservatives, theological, 15, 18–21, 50, 65, 140, 142, 143, 146–47, 153, 154, 156, 195, 227, 229, 231; clergy among, 17–18, 23, 33–34, 37, 38, 47, 142, 146, 148, 153–54, 155, 156, 159, 171, 172, 179, 231, 244 n. 7, 246 n. 3. *See also* Christian Right; evangelicals; fundamentalists; ideology; mainline-evangelical divide; "two-party" system, religious; *names of specific organizations*
constraints on political action, 8, 18, 48, 50, 53, 55–61, 64, 104, 120–38, 191, 192, 195, 227, 230, 233–34. *See also* congregation
conversion. *See* clergy, influence of, on congregations; evangelism; salvation
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship (CBF), 148, 149–50. *See also* Baptists
creationism, 20, 27, 158
Creech, Rev. Jimmy, 6–7, 8, 53, 227
crime, 10, 12, 36, 37, 51, 54, 86, 104, 109, 110–19, 206
"culture wars," 6, 35, 47, 65, 142, 155
Cuomo, Mario, 197, 198, 200

death penalty, 131, 194
Declaration on Religious Liberty, 127–28, 129
defense. *See* military, the; nuclear weapons
Democratic Party, 40, 78, 108, 130, 132, 133, 138, 147, 148, 155, 165, 171, 172, 182, 231
denominations: activism of clergy in, 146, 148–50, 244 n. 4; colleges of, 143, 180, 182,

248 n. 20; leaders of, 120–38, 188–202; lobbying offices of, in Washington, D.C., 11, 149, 186. *See also names of specific denominations*
DePriest, Oscar, 72
Disciples of Christ (Christian Church), 35, 47, 49, 50, 245 n. 1
discrimination: gender, 51–58, 230; racial, 66, 67, 72, 75, 76, 78, 98, 231; sexual-orientation, 20
Disney Company, Walt, 239 n. 1; boycott of, 11, 152
dispensationalism. *See* theology
divinity schools, 33. *See also* education of clergy; seminaries
Dobson, Dr. James, 152. *See also* Focus on the Family
Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, 122, 242 nn. 1, 3
Dole, Robert J., 155, 161, 165
domestic violence, 52, 54, 62, 63
drug abuse. *See* antidrug activities; substance abuse
Du Bois, W. E. B., 66

Economic Justice for All, 125
ecumenical coalitions, 20–21, 22, 66, 68, 72, 80–83, 94, 102, 124, 144, 169–70, 229
education of clergy, 32–34, 35, 89, 90, 100, 102, 103, 141–42, 143, 153, 158, 232, 239 n. 4, 248 n. 20. *See also* denominations; seminaries
electoral politics, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 67–68, 69–70, 76–80, 86, 89, 98, 134, 135–36, 140, 150, 152–53, 162–66, 168–73, 238, 243 n. 2
emancipation, 67, 68
empowerment, 26–27, 87, 96–98, 101, 103. *See also* citizenship; congregation; mobilization
environment, the, 147, 192
Episcopal Church, U.S.A., 39, 49, 50
Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, 149
Evangelical Covenant Church, 245 n. 1
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (E.L.C.A.), 49
Evangelical Mennonites, 180, 247 n. 5. *See also* Anabaptists; Mennonites
evangelicals, 11, 18, 21, 23–24, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32–33, 37, 67, 73, 77, 82, 84, 101, 142, 146, 151, 156, 160–61, 192, 193, 195, 240 n. 1, 245 n. 10, 250 n. 5
evangelism, 218, 220–22, 251 n. 16
evolution, 20, 27, 158

Falwell, Rev. Jerry, 18
family background, effect of, on clergy, 4, 24, 31, 32, 35, 54, 57, 142, 205, 236, 247 nn. 10, 11; *See also* socialization; socioeconomic status
family issues, 21, 194
family values, 6, 20, 99, 161. *See also* "culture wars"; morality politics
Fauntroy, Rev. Walter, 79
Federal Council of Churches, 159
Federal Welfare Reform Act (1996): Charitable Choice provision of, 6, 8, 43
feminism, 23, 47, 58, 64
feminization of clergy, 35, 65
Flake, Rev. Floyd, 79
Focus on the Family, 24, 40, 150, 152, 231
framing, 12, 204, 212–19, 221, 222, 230, 251 nn. 18, 19; defined, 208
Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, 72
free exercise. *See* separation of church and state
Friends, Religious Society of, 186, 240 n. 1
fundamentalists, 21, 101

gambling, 38, 147
Garvey, Marcus, 72
gender of clergy, 9–10, 34–35, 47–65, 230, 236. *See also* feminism; women's rights
General Conference Mennonite Church, 179, 180. *See also* Anabaptists; Mennonites
Goldsmith, Stephen, 116–17, 118
government attention hypothesis, 107, 116–18, 232
government funding, 82, 91, 92, 95, 99–100, 117
Gray, Rev. William, 79
Greater New York Coordinating Committee, 73
Greenville, South Carolina, 6
group consciousness, 105, 106

Hispanics, 30, 251 n. 19
homeless people, 88, 91, 205, 206, 207, 239 n. 5, 250 n. 5

homilies. *See* sermons
homosexuality, 5, 6–7, 20, 52, 53, 194, 197–98, 200, 201, 239 n. 1
homosexuals, marriage between, 6, 53
homosexuals, rights of, 6, 20, 23, 36, 38, 54, 84, 142, 155, 227
housing, 20, 81, 87, 88, 89, 92–93, 94, 95, 100, 103, 250 n. 5

ideology, 86, 141, 144–46, 147–48, 151, 155, 168, 169, 229. *See also* conservatives, theological; liberals, theological
immunization programs, 82
Indianapolis, Indiana, 104–19, 241 n. 1
individualism, 18, 19, 22, 23, 27, 74
Industrial Area Foundations, 4, 87, 97, 98, 241 n. 1. *See also* community organizing; Milwaukee Innercity Congregations Allied for Hope; Philadelphia Interfaith Action
injustice. *See* social justice
inner-city churches, 10, 57, 81, 85–103, 104–19, 203–23, 237
integration. *See* segregation
interest groups, 36, 39–40, 148, 151–52, 165, 166, 227, 231, 238
Interfaith Alliance, 40
Islam, 13, 21, 235, 239 n. 2
Israeli-Arab conflict, 180, 187
issue mobilization, 38–39, 48, 107, 108, 112–13, 141, 146–48, 154, 231. *See also* mobilization

Jackson, Rev. Jesse, 8, 77–78, 195
jeremiads, 75, 80, 82–83
Jews. *See* Judaism
job approval of clergy, 12, 57, 58, 60, 188–202, 233
John Paul II, 120, 130, 137
John XXIII, 189
Judaism, 13, 30, 49, 51, 62–63, 95, 235, 239 n. 2, 240 n. 1, 241 n. 1
justice. *See* social justice

King, Rev. Martin Luther, Jr., 3, 75, 76, 79–80, 82, 205–6
King, Rev. Martin Luther, Sr., 73
Ku Klux Klan, 26

Land, Richard, 149
Law, Bernard Cardinal, 133–34
leadership style, 16–17, 23, 25–27, 50–51, 56, 60, 61–62, 63, 66, 90–94, 101, 102, 210
letters to the editor, 167, 243 n. 2
Lewis, Rev. John, 79
liberals, theological, 18, 49, 50, 54, 65, 143, 145, 146–47, 158, 229; clergy among, 16, 17, 25–26, 33–35, 40, 47, 54, 55, 58, 101, 108, 146, 148, 151, 171, 172, 244 n. 7, 246 n. 3. *See also* clergy-laity gap; mainline-evangelical divide; "two-party" system, religious
lobbying, 11, 41, 72, 82
Lutherans. *See* Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

mainline-evangelical divide, 11, 18, 160–73
media: religious, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 245 n. 10; use of, by clergy, 140, 150, 153, 154, 155, 245 n. 10
membership loss. *See* clergy-laity gap; congregation; constraints on political action
Mennonite Brethren, 180. *See also* Anabaptists; Mennonites
Mennonite Central Committee, 186
Mennonite Peace and Justice Committee, 248 n. 20
Mennonites, 178, 179–80, 186, 247 n. 5, 248 n. 20. *See also* Anabaptists
military, the, 131, 132, 178–80, 186. *See also* nuclear weapons; Vietnam War
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 5, 10, 105, 106, 112, 113, 115, 118
Milwaukee Innercity Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH), 10
ministerial alliances, 39, 77, 86, 95
mobilization: of clergy, 30, 38–40, 48, 62, 64, 86, 104–19, 139–56, 228, 229, 231, 232, 236–37, 241 n. 1 (*see also* government funding); of congregations, 12, 13, 26, 27, 41, 42, 48, 64, 85, 86, 157, 195, 203–23, 233, 234, 235, 236–37, 251 n. 19
Mondale, Walter, 132
morality of war, 178, 181
morality politics, 4, 6, 131–34, 138, 147, 192, 194, 230, 238. *See also* "culture wars"; *names of individual moral issues*
Moral Majority, 19, 20, 21, 158–59
moral reform, 147, 244 n. 6

Mormons. *See* Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
Muslims. *See* Islam

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), 72
National Association of Evangelicals, 82, 159
National Baptist Convention U.S.A., 101. *See also* Baptists
National Black Evangelical Association (NBEA), 82
National Conference of Black Christians (NCBC), 80
National Conference of Black Churchmen, 80
National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 11, 132–33; Political Responsibility Statement of, 133
National Council of Churches, 81–82, 159
Nation of Islam, 72
Negro Convention Movement, 66
neighborhood development. *See* community development
"New Breed" clergy, 34, 38, 39, 146, 151
New York City, 12, 73, 79, 133, 188, 190, 192, 196–202, 234–35
nuclear weapons, 123, 124, 131, 132, 133, 179, 188

O'Connor, John Cardinal, 12, 133, 188–202, 233, 234–35
Omaha, Nebraska, 4, 6, 49–50, 52–53, 55–59, 62–63
opinion leaders, 25, 41–42, 57–58, 102, 133, 188, 198–99, 200, 227, 237–38. *See also* clergy, influence of, on congregations
Opportunities Industrial Centers (OICs), 90
oppression. *See* discrimination; social justice
organizational membership, 117, 140, 141, 150, 154, 231, 244 n. 2. *See also* ministerial alliances; *names of specific organizations*
organizational mobilization, 38–39, 107, 108, 116, 141, 148, 154, 231, 236–37. *See also* mobilization
orthodoxy. *See* theology

pacifism, 12, 124, 177–87, 233, 234, 239 n. 5, 247 nn. 2, 4, 9, 248 nn. 12, 16, 17, 20
particularism, 20, 21, 22, 169
partisanship of clergy, 141, 146, 147, 148, 154, 155, 168, 169, 171, 172, 230, 244 n. 2
Partners in Ecumenism (PIE), 81–82
Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 123–24, 132
peace, 124, 178, 239 n. 5. *See also* pacificism
Peace Sunday, 179, 187
Pentecostals, 12, 37, 71, 75, 195, 240 n. 1, 245 n. 10
Persian Gulf War, 179, 186
petitions, 166–67, 172, 243 n. 2
Pfleger, Rev. Michael ("Father Mike"), 13, 204–23, 234, 235
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 81, 85–103, 231
Philadelphia Council of Black Clergy, 81
Philadelphia Interfaith Action (PIA), 87, 94, 103
pluralism, religious, 3, 13, 96
Poland, 10, 120–21, 126, 128–30, 134–37, 222, 231, 243 nn. 5, 6; Democratic Left Alliance, 13; Freedom Union, 136; Solidarity, 135, 136, 222; Solidarity Electoral Alliance, 136
police departments, 8, 12, 81, 117
political action committees (PACs), 165, 244 n. 2
political activity of clergy: as expectation, 39, 66, 78, 112, 117, 151, 192, 193, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 233, 242 n. 5, 245 n. 8; typology of, 30, 35–38, 106–18, 139, 140, 157–58, 236, 243 n. 2
political connections of clergy, 36, 43, 96–98, 100, 101, 103
political consciousness of clergy, 89, 90
political cues to laity from clergy, 7, 202, 207, 211, 222–23, 250 nn. 4, 5, 6. *See also* public statements by clergy; sermons; study groups
political interest by clergy, 4, 17, 34, 35, 112, 140, 141, 143, 144, 153, 154, 155, 168, 169, 171, 232
political parties, 40, 121, 130–38, 148, 150, 152, 165, 180, 227, 230, 231, 235, 244 n. 5. *See also* Democratic Party; Republican Party
political skills of clergy, 23, 104, 157
political strategies, 9, 10, 66–84, 85–103, 203–23, 230, 231
pornography, 37, 38
poverty, 8, 9, 10, 12, 36, 37, 38, 51, 52, 78, 79, 81, 85, 86, 94–95, 98, 99, 109, 110–19, 131, 133
Powell, Rev. Adam Clayton, Jr., 73, 79
premillennialism. *See* theology

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 26, 35, 39, 47, 49, 50, 80, 101, 245 n. 1
Protestants, 16, 21, 30, 39, 42, 78, 82, 101, 115, 139, 142, 158, 159, 231, 241 n. 1; mainline, 10, 11, 22–23, 26, 31, 32–33, 34, 35, 40, 47, 49, 53, 64, 88, 101, 140, 146, 192, 193, 195, 196, 233, 239 n. 5, 240 n. 1, 246 n. 3; mainline-evangelical divide among, 11, 18, 160–73. *See also* clergy-laity gap; evangelicals; *names of specific Protestant denominations*
protesting, 8, 36, 73, 75–76, 79, 85, 97, 206, 238, 249 n. 1
public statements by clergy, 161–62, 168–69, 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 196–97, 227, 233, 235, 243 n. 2
Puritanism, 69, 75

Quakers, 186, 240 n. 1
Quayle, J. Danforth, 99

race, 10, 84, 182, 193, 195, 205, 227, 231; of clergy, 10. *See also* African American clergy; black church; racism
racism, 8, 26, 52, 75, 78, 83, 85, 100, 192, 195, 205, 231
Ransom, Bishop Reverdy C., 72, 79
rational choice, 21, 108, 191, 193–94. *See also* benefit exchange
Reagan, Ronald, 15, 79, 83, 132
Reconstruction, 69–70
recruitment of clergy to activism, 62, 152–53, 154. *See also* mobilization; organizational mobilization
Reed, Ralph, 19, 21, 37
Reformed Church of America (RCA), 35, 159–72, 229, 245 nn. 1, 2, 246 n. 4. *See also* Reformed clergy
Reformed clergy, 11, 157–73, 229. *See also* Christian Reformed Church; Reformed Church of America
religious diversity, 13, 14, 28
religious persecution, 6, 42
Religious Right. *See* Christian Right
Rendell, Edward, 97
reproductive choice. *See* abortion; birth control
Republican Party, 15, 40, 130, 132, 133, 138, 140, 147, 148, 149, 154, 155, 156, 165, 171, 172, 182, 231
resources, 9, 16, 28, 48, 61, 62–63, 64, 98, 103, 104, 105, 141–43, 157, 188, 230. *See also* authority of clergy; civic skills; socioeconomic status
Robertson, Rev. Marion "Pat," 8, 18, 20, 195, 239 n. 1
Roe v. Wade, 20, 132. *See also* abortion
role orientations, 32, 35, 66–84, 93, 125–26, 141, 142, 146, 153, 154, 155, 188, 228, 236, 238
Roman Catholic Church, 12, 15, 21, 22, 23, 28, 30, 39, 120–38, 140, 188–202, 203–23, 229–31, 234–35, 236, 240 n. 1, 241 n. 1; bishops of, 10–11, 22, 120–38, 202, 229–31, 242 n. 2, 243 n. 6 (*see also names of specific bishops' letters*); college of bishops, 123, 242 nn. 2, 3; pope, 120, 121–22, 123, 134, 137, 189, 190, 242 n. 1; social teachings of, 121, 124–25, 131–34, 138, 192 (*see also* social justice; *names of specific church statements*). *See also names of individual church leaders*
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 130, 134

St. Sabina Catholic Church, 204–23, 250 n. 7
salvation, 23, 32, 74, 144, 145, 158, 160
schools, 50, 51, 86, 100, 129, 180, 194; boards of, 70, 71; curriculums of, 20, 27, 142, 158; desegregation of, 76; parochial, 128, 131, 132; prayer in, 19, 27, 147, 155, 188, 207, 250 n. 5; tuition tax credits for private, 131, 132; tuition vouchers for private, 19–20, 231. *See also* denominations; education of clergy; seminaries
Scopes Trial, 158. *See also* evolution
"seamless garment," 133
segregation, 25, 67, 70, 75, 76
self-selection: by clergy, 31–32, 55, 107, 109, 111–12, 113, 118–19, 232, 247 n. 11; by congregants, 25, 183–85, 203, 208–10
seminaries, 33–34, 47, 55, 142, 143, 171, 206, 236, 237, 248 n. 20. *See also* education of clergy
separation of church and state, 3, 11, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 67, 127, 128, 129, 148, 230
sermons, 7, 13, 36, 41, 133, 160, 161–62, 171, 172, 178, 179, 187, 204, 207, 210, 211, 212, 215, 218, 221, 233, 234, 235, 243 n. 2
sex, premarital, 192, 194, 198, 200, 201
sex education, 142
sexism, 51–58, 230

sexual morality, 239 n. 5, 250 n. 5
slavery, 66, 68, 69, 75
social capital, 15, 102
Social Gospel, 17, 145, 158, 206
socialization: of clergy, 24, 30–35, 38, 48–49, 55, 64, 102, 205–6, 227, 228, 232, 236, 238; in congregations, 13, 15, 22, 26–28, 41–42, 71, 106. *See also* citizenship; clergy, influence of, on congregations; congregation
social justice, 49, 55, 64, 67, 74, 75–76, 79–80, 84, 85, 97, 99, 101, 102, 105, 111, 115, 147, 188, 195, 205, 206, 216, 239 n. 5, 244 n. 6
social movements. *See* social movement theory; *names of specific movements*
social movement theory, 207–8, 212–23, 238
social services, 3, 8, 82, 84, 134. *See also* housing; poverty; welfare
social theologies, 9, 17, 20, 35, 42, 86, 101–2, 144–46, 154–55, 158, 168, 170, 206, 228–29, 231, 232. *See also* black liberation theology; Roman Catholic Church
socioeconomic model, 105, 141–43, 232
socioeconomic status: of clergy, 31, 32, 53, 86, 104, 105, 106, 141–43, 144, 153, 155, 232; of congregation, 10, 86, 180, 182, 205, 235
Southern Baptist Convention, 11, 33, 34, 39, 40, 139–56, 231, 236, 239 n. 3, 243 n. 1, 245 nn. 1, 10. *See also* Baptists
Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 75, 80
Spellman, Francis Cardinal, 127
study groups, 7, 166, 172, 243 n. 2
substance abuse, 205, 206, 217, 219, 235, 251 n. 16
Sullivan, Rev. Leon, 90, 103

Tammany Hall, 73
tenure, clerical, influence of length of, 89, 102, 142, 150, 151, 169, 170–71, 183, 247 n. 5
theology: dispensationalism, 144–45, 154–55, 244 n. 3; inerrancy, 22, 23, 160; orthodoxy, 17, 21, 22, 38, 144, 145, 146, 154–55, 160–68, 169, 170, 172, 173, 179, 228–29, 239 n. 2, 244 n. 3, 245 n. 3, 246 n. 5; premillennialism, 145, 158. *See also* authority of clergy; black liberation theology; Calvinism; Roman Catholic Church; social theologies
Tocqueville, Alexis de, 4, 15
"two-party" system, religious, 16, 21, 158

United Methodist Church, 6, 35, 39, 42, 47, 49, 52–53, 58, 75, 101, 195, 245 n. 1

Vatican, the, 120, 127, 189–90
Vatican Councils: First, 122; Second, 122, 123–24, 127, 132, 189, 242 nn. 1, 3. *See also* Roman Catholic Church
Vietnam War, 36, 38, 127, 142, 158, 186
violence, 8, 205, 206, 217, 235
Voting Rights Act (1965), 76

Washington, D.C., 11, 49–50, 55–57, 59, 61–62, 82
Washington, Harold, 77
Webster v. Reproductive Health Services, 20. *See also* abortion
welfare, 71, 99, 132, 147. *See also* social services
welfare reform, 6, 52, 54. *See also* Federal Welfare Reform Act (1996)
West, Cornel, 82–83
Wilmore, Rev. Gayraud, 80
women clergy, 9–10, 34–35, 47–65, 230, 240 nn. 1, 2, 2
women's rights, 52–53, 147. *See also* feminism
Woodbey, Rev. George Washington, 79

Yearick, Rev. David, 6–7, 8, 227
Young, Rev. Andrew, 79, 203

This page intentionally left blank

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Christian clergy in American politics / edited by Sue E. S. Crawford and Laura R. Olson.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8018-6704-5 (alk. paper)

I. Clergy—United States—Political activity. 2. Christianity and politics—United States. I. Crawford, Sue E. S., 1967–
II. Olson, Laura R., 1967–

BV4327.C48 2001

323′.042′088204—dc21 00-054603